IN SEARCH OF INTUITIVE KNOWLEDGE: A COMPARISON OF EASTERN AND WESTERN EPISTEMOLOGY

by

Arunjit Gill
M. Ed., Simon Fraser University, 2001

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the
Faculty
of
Education

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer, 2006

APPROVAL

Name: **Arunjit Gill**

Degree: **Doctor of Philosophy**

Title of Dissertation: **In Search of Intuitive Knowledge: A Comparison of Eastern and Western Epistemology**

Examining Committee:

Chair: **Dr. Michael Ling**
Lecturer, Professor, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Allan MacKinnon
Senior Supervisor
Professor, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Paul Shaker
Supervisor
Dean and Professor, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Heesoon Bai

Internal Examiner
Professor, Simon Fraser University

Dr. Karen Meyer
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia

Date Approved: Apr. 18/06

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I discuss the basic postulates of Indian schools of epistemology with the inherent purpose of highlighting certain axiological contributions for the benefit of the Indo-Canadian community in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. It is my sincere belief that an examination of their Indian historical roots will incline them to look back at their sacred past and favor a healthy lifestyle. So far there has never been a discussion of the interpretative, evaluative and academic implications of Indian philosophy in the community setting for obvious reasons, enamored as we have been of everything Western. In examining the ability to know and to conceive reality, values are also discussed to clarify their role in our notions of intuition. Important Western as well as influential Eastern philosophical works by Descartes, Locke, and Radhakrishnan, will be analyzed. The distinction that sets Indian epistemology apart, suffice to say, is its comprehensiveness which embraces many tenants such as spirituality and self-realization, all which are intrinsically linked and inseparable. It is due to the important nature of their relevance to any community facing the ills of the modern day that this thesis introduces intuitive knowledge and considers an integration of epistemology and axiology as a possible solution. As the demand for knowledge solutions becomes greater every day, the question of its philosophical synthesis gains more currency in terms of how best to live our life.

Keywords:

Intuition, Eastern epistemology, philosophy and religion in education

DEDICATION

For our *Dadji*, Balram Gill, who has raised three children as both "father and mother" after the departure of Gurbux Kaur Gill. Thank you for instilling in us the true values of hard work, honestly and benevolence. Without your guidance, we would not have been able to claim success from the terrible affliction which has claimed others in our community. With heartfelt love, admiration, and respect from your loving son. Shallene and I aspire to instil the same values in our boys: Ajay and Arvin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With deepest thanks to Professor MacKinnon for understanding the difficulty of balancing family life, work and academia and thereby extending the greatest of flexibility and assistance in the writing of this dissertation.

PROLOGUE

My choice to write in the aforementioned manner that I do is to address an urge. While writing my dissertation I hit a point where I was becoming intrigued by people in the Indo-Canadian community who had unearthed their true calling and were either writing stories of their life or on important social issues. I needed to provide direction to where my thesis was heading, and wanted to ensure that when the ending came it wouldn't be shallow. It must be something unique, distinct and contributory to the community. Thus, when I saw and read about those who fought the seduction of money, the glory of guns with its powerful allure, I related, understood and knew what had to be done. I was out of work when I was much younger and also thought at that time that I could have "hustled" up an easy life. But then often, there were times when I wasn't sure if I could. Fortunately, I didn't. There were many others who broke away from the chorus to learn the sound of their own voice. Nothing seems braver to me than setting on a journey and filtering out the chatter that tells us to be someone we're not, and instead listen to one's inner voice.

I decided on the simplest approach possible when embarking on my research. I would address my topic by reading whatever intrigued me, trusting my intuition; allowing my inner voice to provide some leads. I had no idea that sticking to this simple method would soon take me to so much literature, and far deeper into philosophical speculation than I'd ever gone as a researcher. Having reviewed hundreds of books and spending countless hours at the library, I soon realized I was no expert on how to go

about articulating my from-the-heart-research. I had been humbled into admitting I knew nothing, and was continuously humbled time and time again by these great Western and Eastern philosophers and the wisdom they seemed to radiate so naturally in their writing. I learned much on the multiplicity of intuitive thought – "Here's what this person says, in a similar situation….". In a few instances, when I sensed my own passivity was inappropriately taking a wrong turn I tried to guide myself by reminding myself of my comprehensive examination questions. I didn't handle all these decisions perfectly and only reveal these moments now to show my own fallibility.

Many of the classical philosophers posed a great many questions that helped steer my research. The majority of these questions were of the rhetorical, merely intellectual/devil's advocate type but were difficult and challenging to address. There were screamingly obvious questions, but it seemed that they were almost so obvious that I hadn't learned to correctly answer them, as if the answers should be obvious too, which they're weren't. I found that the biggest obstacle to answering the question this thesis poses though recognizing the possibility of the role of intuitive knowledge, people do not "live" it.

This thesis does not research the history of the question, "how we know what we know". I didn't quote all the great philosophers, East and West, who specifically articulated about innate knowledge, nor did I ignore them if they didn't. My biggest coup was how my father folded into my research and helped as an expert resource/reference in addressing questions related to Indian epistemology. His response and advice has always been to "follow your heart". Writing this research hadn't come easily for me. I've become very protective of my methodological style since I was once so afraid that

"writing from the heart" was incompatible with being a doctoral student. For the last two years, this fear had stopped me from mixing the two. It's a far different paper from what I originally envisioned. It reflects what I felt was worth writing with little regard to be inclusive of all viewpoints. I didn't consider writing about any particular philosopher unless I had read at least ten or twelve books on him, all were men. This itself was no guarantee for inclusion as even by then the meaning of their writing was just beginning to show itself. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the way I've arranged the epistemological beliefs. Since my method conveys how I'm suggesting we think about intuitive knowledge, an explanation is therefore necessary.

This thesis doesn't follow a conventional outline. It seemed that every week I sketched out another scenario for grouping these philosophers' views. Most had fair claim to several schools of thought, while many never fit. It was always clear that the benefits of categorization were outweighed by the harm in compartmentalizing a Romanised term or Sanskrit concept for ease of structuring my paper, e.g. *tabula rasa, parusarthas, etc.*

Nevertheless, I couldn't shake the urge to tame the question by shackling it with some orderly form. In the end, the human soul resisted taxonomy. What nourishes one person may harm another. I recognized that my urge to classify was an attempt to make this journey easy or quick, and to strive for simplification demonstrated hubris on my part and a lack of appreciation for the intuitive route I should take. And once I'd recognized that, I finally found the right arrangement. Philosophers have all sorts of philosophical stumbling blocks that keep them from providing all the sought after answers. So this dissertation is not solely organized by a geographical worldview or by a philosophical

school of thought, rather it is a flow from one worldview to another. It uses themes to demonstrate misunderstandings and shortcomings, and shows how philosophers have confronted them or have gotten past them. It's not meant to be read out of order, though there's no harm in that. It is meant to build on each other. Ideas and terminology brought up earlier and invoked subsequently is meant to resemble a rolling conversation, but one in which the ideas are continually reined in by dogged reality. When people heard my thesis' title, the most common question I'd get asked was, "So your paper's about knowledge?" My response would be to warn them not to get trapped by semantics and answer, "It's about being honest with oneself".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE – EASTERN PHILOSOPHY

1.1 Introduction

My thesis is written with the desire to synergize the ideals of Eastern thought with those of the empirical temperament of the West. Its main purpose is to determine how Eastern philosophy might extend and contribute to Western notions about knowledge. The pursuit of knowledge in India is not a science of ascertaining facts but an ideal quest of values that develops under the conviction that the basic aim of knowledge is to cultivate a holistic-view of human beings, the cosmos and Ultimate Reality. This paper's emphasis is to recognize, highlight and compare the aspects valued in Indian thought with those of the West. Intuition and its role as a source of knowledge is explored from various perspectives with an aim in demonstrating that the roots of our knowledge lie in what we innately possess.

What emerges is a comparison of Indian and Western values of knowledge that attempts to bring to light the core of "the problem". In the West, empiricism and rationalism are generally "recognized" sources of knowledge, whereas intuitionism isn't. Western epistemology emphasizes scientific principles and shows great regard for methodology which is measurable and demonstrable, unlike intuition. Indian epistemology, on the other hand, not only recognizes our innate sense of knowing, our inner consciousness and spiritual component, but more importantly considers it the basis of knowledge. Addressing this problem will bring a host of other Indian views into play: what is the aim of knowledge, how is it acquired and how do we judge its validity. These

questions should evoke the sense of values that we assign to the means of knowing. The question of values is inevitable in this context. It provides the foundation to help us determine the aim and objective of our philosophy. Our knowledge and how we perceive it helps us prepare for life and gives us meaning and purpose.

Indian philosophy is rooted in Indian culture. The basic characteristic of Indian culture is an integrated approach not only to knowledge but to life. The microcosm and macrocosm have been interpreted identically with an eye on totality, thus incorporating all aspects: the mental, physical and spiritual. Indian philosophy of knowledge is a happy synthesis of idealism and pragmatism, unity and diversity. While laying emphasis upon individuality and self-realization, Indian schools at the same time have recognized the value of plurality and communal obligation as equally important expressions (Bishop, 1975, p. 17). This has been reflected in specific ideals strived for and forms the basis which underlies life, which is never left out of sight, and in the ultimate analysis is regarded as paramount. The difficulty that lies in preserving a unity between the spiritual and practical point of view is based ultimately on values. Hence it is regarded as essential that a pupil's life should be lived in an environment permeated by worthy ideals. Such a philosophy of integrating the aims, curriculum, teaching methods, and practice of self-realization has been advanced in modern times by Swami Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Swami Dayananada, M.K. Gandhi, Rabindranath Tagore, and Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan (Yvas, 1982, p. XIII). These contemporary Indian educational philosophers have presented the ancient wine of wisdom in new bottles in the form of their philosophies of knowledge. They openly swear by the ancient scriptures and develop their ideas on its foundations by interpreting the old principles in the light of new

knowledge and in the context of the current age. My task is to answer "how we know what we know" by searching through the annals of ancient Indian philosophy and determine how the role of intuition can enrich and contribute to Western notions of knowledge. It is hoped that the following work sets out to exemplify just what it means to live a life of harmony, and how for the many *"apnas"*, it is possible to do so in a world of contradictions.

1.2 Outline

The first part of my thesis is devoted to the task of the aims of philosophy in India and the West. Chapter 1 deals with how the Indian philosophy of knowledge has evolved from the philosophy of life as its basis. These aims spring out of the foundations laid down by the sacred books of Indian thought and have either inspired indirectly or contributed directly to the evolution of Indian epistemology (Muller, 2004, p.214). Hindu knowledge (*samyak-jnana*), lifestyle (*samyak-charita*), and worldview (*samyak-darsana*) are analyzed through various subsets. The core principles of knowledge, the path Indians follow to live up to these principles is explored. Thus, an understanding and historical account of classical Indian philosophy is a necessary prelude to an understanding of the Indian worldview. The chapter provides a comprehensive overview of principles, which, admittedly, one may find somewhat unconventional and therefore contentious. They are offered, however, in the typical Indian spirit of *anekantavada* (acceptance of multiple viewpoints), which emphasizes inclusiveness and tolerance of differing systems of thought (Bishop, 1975, p.3). This, however, must not be construed in any way other than as an attempt to encourage an understanding and active ongoing inquiry into Indian views of knowledge. The next chapter tackles the role of our intuitive or subconscious

knowledge in Hindu epistemology that considers logic, perception, inference, analogy, and scriptures along with intuition as mere mechanisms through which we gain knowledge. The special characteristic of these Indian theories as distinguished from those of the West is that though these different schools express a diversity of views, all still present a mark of unity; a holistic and integrated outlook. The point of agreement among the different schools becomes evident by the fact that all these "systems" regard knowledge as a practical necessity and cultivate it in order to understand how life can be best led.

In the second part, I propose what may be considered a critique of the two main sources of knowledge in the West: empiricism and rationalism. Using innate knowledge as a reference, this paper will seek to examine the nature of these theories and the relation in which they stand to each other and highlight aspects that have been overlooked. Thus, my inquiry into the facts and state of affairs of these two prevalent schools of Western epistemological thought, that have long been engaged in a philosophical debate, provides a background for a new view of knowledge. The construction of a meta-theory of intuition (via an integrated philosophy of knowledge synthesized from Indian ideals and Western concepts) is undertaken in the third part of the thesis. That philosophy, the integration of the dynamic aspect of metaphysics and axiology, the idealistic relation that has always existed between philosophy and knowledge in India, is expounded. This alternative view of intuitive knowledge has been extracted from the various schools of Western thought and frames the Hindu theory. In assessing the role of intuition in Indian and Western epistemology, I propose a comparative approach as the most satisfying method in devising an analytic scheme for understanding how intuition shapes our lives.

1.3 Method

There are potential benefits and risks of interpreting the philosophy of one culture through another. In the West, there are clearly demarcated realistic, naturalistic, and pragmatic philosophies of education, whereas in the East the situation is quite different. India does not have an educational philosophy that is a separate intellectual discipline.

> Indian philosophy discusses the different problems of Metaphysics, Ethics, Logic, Psychology, and Epistemology, but generally does not discuss them separately. Every problem is discussed by the Indian philosopher from all possible approaches, metaphysical, ethical, logical, psychological and epistemological. (Chatterjee, 1950, p.3)

Indian and Western philosophical traditions are so diverse that it makes having to determine which starting point and which method as the most adequate for solving a particular problem very difficult. A comparative thesis of Eastern and Western epistemology nevertheless, has great potentialities. By comparing ourselves with others, the critique eventually becomes a critique of ourselves. Such a critique involves the discovery of what has been missed, what has been overemphasized, and what may have been incorrectly posited. Often we are intrigued by a new view of reality, but if the approach and method is inappropriate to that reality, we tend to discredit it and explain it away. Having explained it away or substituted something else for it, we find ourselves at an impasse to explain certain experiences that depend on the former reality.

A comparison of Indian epistemology, which has an idealistic and spiritual approach, may be quite alien to the Western viewpoint. *Prima facie* this task may appear to be difficult and undesirable for various reasons, but one can arrive at significant conclusions which will open new vistas in the philosophical and sociological scene as it

enables one to see what is living and what is dead in one's own tradition. Such an enterprise may not suit the spirit of the modern day which seeks to identify the logic in other systems. Life in the present era is dominated by what is called scientific temper which gradually fuses skepticism in the minds of the present day younger generation (Prajnanananda, 1973, p.5). The problem of this minority group is of great importance because their behavior and that of the majority may be diametrically opposite to each other resulting in tension and exploitation. Today the minority group is striving hard to strengthen their wrongly supposed weak position, and ever trying to extract concessions from the majority in the form of vice behavior. Because of certain prejudices, malice and hostility arise in both groups with each side reaching certain judgments about the other without due reasoning. How does prejudice arise? It does not spring up all of a sudden. Its root is deeply embedded from particular experiences. Certain prejudices crop up because of bad conditions and parental attitudes. By the time children become adults their behavior has become a mirror of their parents, teachers and others around them in society. Prejudices of the young can be traced to their upbringing. Prejudices are learnt. Therefore, they may also be forgotten.

One should not do comparison just for intellectual curiosity, but for a purpose and to be critical. Thus, while advocating intuition, one of India's greatest philosopher, Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan's theory will be criticized, otherwise one cannot know whether its tenants are one-sided or determine what is lacking. What is lacking may be found in the culture of the other. Comparisons often reveal valuable principles or ignored consistencies. A comparison of Eastern and Western philosophy can result in an integrated global philosophy and be recognized as an important activity in which the East

and West can best try to understand each other in various ways. A comparative study of philosophies provides us with some clues in regard to the nature of human values which are of paramount importance to the entire human race.

Though a comparison of philosophies is a useful exercise, there are those who may argue that it is impossible and undesirable. How can Eastern philosophy, i.e. Indian epistemology, which is spiritual in essence, be compared with Western philosophy which is secular? To say that such a comparison between East and West is not possible amounts to saying that we cannot understand each other. For example, one may compare Spinoza's conception of substance with Sankara's Brahman. It is true, there is a noticeable difference between the methods of these two philosophers. Spinoza's substance, like Sankara's Brahman, transcends discursive thought. However, Spinoza failed to recognize the inconsistency that results when making an attempt to deduce the empirical world from what transcends our discursive thought. In addition, Spinoza assigns a very important role to the method of deduction in his philosophical system. On the contrary, Sankara did not think of deduction as a legitimate method. "His method is dialectical, making use of the principle of non-contradiction" (Raju, 1935, p. 98). Sankara's method should be more appropriately compared with that method of Bradley's. Even this comparison may not appear all that legitimate as Sankara's method has negative significance whereas the method of Bradley has positive significance (Yvas, 1982, p. 68). Therefore, one should not do comparison just for comparison sake. Comparison should be between system and system, but not between concept and concept. Eastern philosophers are often characterized as intuitive, spiritual, mystical, and introversive while their Western counterparts are said to be rational, materialistic, and

extroversive. This differentiation is not accepted by one and all since it goes against the available fact; there are Western philosophies that mirror Indian idealism and its rich religious culture as there are many Indian perspectives that are reflect the pragmatic philosophies of the West (Herman, 1976, p. 178). Mutual understanding is the first step towards a comparative analysis.

As with many older civilizations, much of India's varied and rich epistemological history has been captured in detailed oral tradition and a combination of lore, extant texts, and references cited from early Vedic literature and scriptures (Dalvi, 2004, p.95). Conclusions drawn from such sources can be very confusing. Due to the close intertwining relationship between philosophy and religion, a concentrated effort is made to separate the two thereby providing a secular thesis palatable for a Western audience. In order for us to truly view Indian knowledge in modern light, we need to firstly excavate the foundations of its religious culture in order to discover the abiding elements in it. Secondly, having secured the abiding elements, we have to build on them a firm and imposing structure while preserving the living elements of its ancient culture, and recondition them to suite the demands of the modern age.

Different cultures advocate different tradition, standards and values of life, or the same tradition may uphold different standards and different values of life at different periods of history. Whatever may be the case, the ultimate aim of all philosophies is to dig into the nature of life. The digging may be done from different directions, or from the same direction with different tools. The task of a comparative analysis is to find the significance of both the similarities and differences in results as well as methods seen in various traditions and highlight them and their relevance to human life.

1.4 Aim of Philosophy

A comparative analysis of Eastern and Western epistemology will be clearer by an initial discussion of the aim of philosophy. Literally speaking, the word "philosophy" involves two Greek words—*philo* meaning love and *sophia* meaning wisdom [1]. In its original meaning, philosophy, as a "love of wisdom is rightfully interpreted in the sense of those who are lovers of the vision of truth" (Jowett, 1988, p. 485). With Indian philosophy, the "final aim is not only the love of wisdom, but the life of wisdom" (Raju, 1971. p. XIII). In its original meaning, philosophy, as a love of wisdom, actually comes nearest to the Sanskrit word *Jijyasa*, a desire to know, if not a desire to be wise (Muller, 2004, p. 213). Thus, the more the philosopher tries to know, the nearer they come to some basic principle of experience, which they apply and practice in their own life. Therefore, philosophy results in action. Dewey remarked, "Whenever, philosophy has been taken seriously, it has always been assumed that it signified achieving a wisdom which would influence the conduct of life. Witness the fact that almost all ancient schools of philosophy were also organized ways of living..."(Dewey, 1953, p. 378). Philosophy has a direct and most intimated relationship with the outlook on life. It leads to adopting a way of life which would lead to a distinct and well-sought goal. In this way, philosophy results in the adoption of a certain definite and desired way of life. If a person has a philosophy of life, it becomes of some use to them. A certain belief about life is not merely an academic matter, but an example which could enlighten and redeem a person from getting lost in a quandary.

---

[1] www.wordinfo.info/words/index.php?v=info&a=view_results&s=epistemology

If we consider philosophy as an examination of our means of knowledge (epistemology) or as with Kant as an inquiry into the limits of human knowledge, then the Indian term *darsana* is appropriate (Muller, 2004, p. 213). However, the Indian conception of a *darsana* is different from the western idea of a system of philosophy in the way it is termed and extended. While Western epistemology may be understood to be an examination of our knowledge, Indian epistemology takes it a step further and adds to it the experiences of persons of clearer minds and purer hearts treating them as human witnesses to the truth, of the Absolute. Therefore, *darsana* means direct knowledge of reality, of a direct experience of Brahman or intuition of Atman, that which resides in us and transcends the categories of time, space and causation known as nescience (Yvas, 1982, p. 71).

> Darsana is a spiritual perception, a whole view revealed to the soul sense. This soul sight, which is possible, only when and how philosophy is lived, is the distinguished mark of a true philosopher. Darsana is putting the intuition to proof and propagating it logically. (Radhakrishnan, 1999, p. 44)

In this regard, the Western definition of inquiry differs from the Indian one of conduct. However, one must be careful not to characterize Indian philosophy as solely practical and Western philosophy as theoretical. This is incorrect. The statement that philosophy is "love of wisdom" is also misrepresented. Greek philosophers were never merely interested in transmitting "love of wisdom", they also bequeathed well defined philosophical doctrines as is the case with Indian philosophy. The philosophies of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle were practice-oriented as they were intended to develop the doctrines of political, ethical and social action. We simply cannot brand a philosophical tradition theoretical or practical without understanding the context on which these terms

are used in different realms. If we fail to notice this fact, the result is the "fallacy of misplaced comparisons" (Raju, 1970, p.66).

The different *darsanas* of Indian tradition have presented different views about the nature of truth. Truth is one view that differs from one *darsana* to another. Thus, there is a broad division of Indian philosophical systems into groups. A striking difference between Western and Indian philosophy is that whereas in the former we generally find different schools coming into existence successively, each school becoming prominent and succeeded by another one. Of the latter, on the other hand, different schools sprang up simultaneously; they flourished together during many centuries and pursued parallel courses of growth. The primary reason for such a state of affairs lay in the fact that in India philosophy was a part of life. As soon as a system came into existence, it was practically adopted as a way of life by a band of followers who formed a school of that philosophy. They actually lived the philosophy and transmitted it to subsequent generations of followers, who were attracted towards them through their conduct. Hence, Indian philosophical thought repeatedly advises people to have direct knowledge or immediate experience of the highest truth.

> Indian philosophy is not merely metaphysical speculation but has its foundation in the immediate data of experience. The verities of life like the soul are regarded by the Hindu mind, not as concepts speculative and problematic, as is the case in Western philosophy, but as definitely experienced truths. These ultimate truths can be experienced not merely by a chosen few but under right conditions by all humanity. (Prabhananda, 1977, p.1)

The aim of philosophy raises queries about the nature of man and the possibility of its modification and transformation, and depends on the culture concerning the individual and society. "It", said G.D.H. Cole, "must depend on the kind of society we mean to live in, on the qualities in men and women on which we set the highest value, and on the estimates which we make of the educability both of those who are endowed with the higher intellectual or aesthetic capabilities and of ordinary people" (Cole, 1950, p. 47). Aiming at the guidance of knowledge into practice was of essential importance to the sages of India since they regarded philosophy as a means of shaping one's practical life. In India, philosophy is never taken to be merely speculative or hair splitting but a practical way of moulding life with an end in view. In other words, "The ancient Indian did not stop at the discovery of truth, but strove to realize it in his own experience" (Hiriyanna, 1951, p. 18).

Though the basic aim of Eastern and Western educational philosophies is similar, the main difference is seen in the method of philosophical inquiry. The Indian tendency is synthetic in make-up as its philosophy embraces several sources: perception, reason and intuition, which differentiates it from the West. According to Sri Aurobindo, "the work of philosophy is to arrange that data given by the various means of knowledge, excluding none, and putting them into synthetic relation to the one truth, the one Supreme and Universal Reality" (Aurobindo, 1951, p. 72). Philosophy should be integrated, synthetic and all comprehensive. The special characteristics of Indian schools of thought as distinguished from those of the West is that in the West it is often confined to the satisfaction of intellectual curiosity, whereas in India it is to have life fully enlightened with insight from all sources.

> Although philosophy is called darsana, this does not mean that it eschews reason. This is one characteristic difference between Indian philosophy and Western philosophy. The West has gone wholly either for intuition or for reason. When it accepted the standpoint of intuition, as in the Middle Ages, it banned reason entirely. When, as in the Modern Age it gave prominence to reason, it showed contempt for intuition. In India, philosophy has a different tale to tell. There has never been a conflict between intuition and reason, and each has always been given its due place. Different schools of philosophy discuss the highest achievements of life in different ways and yet there is a practical unanimity among those schools, in looking upon the nature of the Ultimate Reality as that which is revealed by direct intuition, and that is why philosophy is called darsana. (Maitra, 1947, p. 10)

1.5 Intuition

As a means to knowledge, intuition has an important place specifically in epistemology and philosophy in general. Originally derived from the Latin word *intueri* it was taken to mean "to look at" [2]. It has been described as a hunch, a gut feeling, or simply our sixth sense. It speaks to us, giving us insight to help us make decisions about any number of actions that we take. Presently, it is usually designated as a form of mystical awareness, scientific genius, poetic insight, ethical conscience as well as religious faith. "It is unfortunate that the single term 'intuition' has been employed to represent so much. Though these terms represent the integral activity of the mind, the activity is oriented towards knowing in some cases and enjoyment or creation in others" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 200). However, intuition should be referred to as an integrated experience as there is an element of intuition present in all our knowledge and everyday activities; our experiences, actions, awareness and consciousness. Even in the fields of science, intuition has played an instrumental role. All inferences in logic and mathematics at one stage of their enquiry depended solely on the truth of a proposition not having any

[2] (www.nd.edu, n.d.)

proof or evidence for support. One either knows it or does not. The nineteenth century French philosopher Henri Bergson gave absolute importance to intuition as contrasted with reason or intellect. He believed that we discover the "élan vital", the vital impulse of the world by intuition rather than by intellect (Tarnas, 1991, p. 383). Similarly, Radhakrishnan also gave utmost importance to intuition. The intuitive faculty is thought to be a higher faculty of apprehension than intellect itself. While intellect gives a discursive account of the specific issue at hand, intuition, at one glance, provides a synthetic picture of the whole. However, in spite of the important role of intuition in different fields of knowledge, it has not been able to claim credibility in the modern day West, unlike rationalism and empiricism (Datta, 1972, pp.11-12).

Not only must intuition be accepted as one of the sources of knowledge, but it must also be regarded as a form of thought. "Intuition is not independent but emphatically dependent upon thought and is immanent in the very nature of our thinking. It is dynamically continuous with thought and pierces through the conceptual content of knowledge to the living reality under it" (Radhakrishnan, 1982, p. 250). However, intuition is qualitatively different from logical thought, though not discontinuous with it. Both logical and intuitive kinds of knowledge are justified and have their own rights. Each is useful and has its own specific purpose. Logical thought enables us to know the conditions so the world in which we live, and to control them for our ends. Without knowing properly we cannot act successfully, but if we want to know things in their uniqueness, in their indefeasible reality, we must transcend discursive thinking. The emphasis, it should be noted, is on transcending rather than abandoning discursive thought.

Between intuition and other forms of knowledge, there is no hiatus. A person's awareness is, broadly speaking, of three kinds - the perceptional, the logical and the intuitive. All three belong to the human consciousness. Those who exalt intuition at the expense of other modes of knowledge often begin with the mistaken notion that the mind is a conglomeration of separated faculties. However, the human mind does not function in fractions. We need not assume that at the sense level there is no work for intuition or at the level of intuition there is no work for the intellect. When intuition is defined as integrated insight, the suggestion is that the whole mind is at work (Schilpp, 1952, Library of living philosophers, p. 791).

This emphasis on the totality of the knowledge process brings the Indian view of intuition very close to the philosophical basis of Gestalt psychology. Like the views of Wertheimer and Kaffka, the Indian view of intuition consists of the all-inclusive nature of the action of perception –using the word "perception" in the widest sense (Wertheimer, 1945, p. 234). "All dynamic acts of thinking, whether in a game of chess or a mathematical problem, are controlled by an intuitive grasp of the situation as a whole" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 149). This is true at all levels, beginning with the simple thinking involved in ordinary processes of life and ending in the most complex methods of logical reasoning. In every logical proof there is a grasping of the intellectual togetherness as a whole, an intuition of the whole as sustained by the different steps. Not only creative insight but ordinary understanding of anything is implied in this process (Ibid, p.181).

While thus recognizing that, by virtue of grasping of the whole involves intuition, we must be careful to give logic its due. With the Indian view, there is no conflict with

reason and intuition and accordingly the role of reason has always been accepted. The intellect does not stand discredited simply because it does not give us all what we want. There is a danger of belittling logic and, in the name of intuition, of declaring philosophy to be a matter of passion and feeling rather than of deduction and clarification. Intuition, if not adequately supported by the intellect, will "lapse into self-satisfied obscurantism". If the content of intuition is to be deepened it must be made intellectual. Intuition must never be used "as an apology for doctrines which could not or would not be justified on intellectual grounds" (Radhakrishnan, 1956. p. 38).

The ancient Indian thinkers were aware of the danger that accompanies excessive dependence upon intuition. They knew that intuition, like Yoga, requires much preparation and can be trusted only if one seeking knowledge is well equipped to employ it. They demanded not only a certain intellectual development but also adequate moral preparation before the intuitive method could be expected to yield the highest results (Schilpp, 1952, The Philosophy of Radhakrishnan, p. 91). The view was that in genuine intuition, "the mind must first be set free from anxiety and desire. There must be absolute inward purity and self-mastery before shaping the soul into harmony with invisible realities"(Radhakrishnan, 1980, p.111). At times, intuitive thought may demand continuous creative effort and is often the result of a long and arduous process of study and analysis. Other times, intuitive knowledge is effortless and spontaneous. Guesswork and speculation can sometimes guide us to the truth by accident. Just as the deepest feelings of a great poet are sometimes conveyed in words of disarming simplicity, so also does a philosopher sometimes announce momentous spiritual discoveries through simple and effortless intuition. This may seem to be in conflict with the earlier statements that

intuition demands intense preparation and rests upon certain rigorous pre-requisites, but the contradiction is only apparent. To develop the ability of wielding intuition as an effective tool of knowledge, a high degree of intellectual, psychological and even moral preparation is necessary. The actual process of wielding the tool is characterized by an ease and facility that is lacking in other types of knowledge.

When all these qualifications have been made and warnings issued, the fact remains that intuition can be considered a superior means of knowledge in many respects compared to other sources. A better method is not necessarily the only method, and there may be occasion when the method which is described as best-on-the-whole may not be altogether suitable. There may be aspects of knowledge in which the intuitive method would be a subordinate element in the process of knowing. Intuition is subjective, intimately personal and may be ineffable. This may be considered a limitation, but it must be remembered that the subtlety and sharpness of thought is also bound up with individuality. However, at the highest reaches of knowledge intuition offers advantages which neither perception nor reason can offer. In fact, it makes possible an "extension of perception to regions beyond sense and leads to an awareness of real values which are neither object in space and time nor universals of thought" (Radhakrishnan, 1982, p.100).

The fact that it is unverifiable in the scientific sense, and that it is incommunicable to others does not deprive intuition of its validity. One may object as to what proof we can offer for the validity of intuition? My reply is that the impossibility of denying it is itself a proof of its authenticity. "The proof and validity of the intuitive principle is somewhat similar to Kant's proof of *a priori* elements. We cannot think them

away. We cannot disbelieve them and remain intellectual. They belong to the very structures of our mind" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 156).

1.6 Overview of Indian Knowledge

Discussing intuition as a necessary precursor to Indian epistemology allows us to proceed to examine its moorings. It needs to be mentioned at this point that the intuitive approach is an acknowledged source of knowledge from the Indian point of view as are the empirical and rational theories by the West. As stated earlier, there are objections that the Indian worldview that is proposed to be studied is too different from the Western worldview for any such meaningful comparison, i.e. the realist and pragmatic approach which forms an important part of the literature on contemporary epistemology in the West is unlike the metaphysical nature of knowledge embraced in the East. They have very little in common. Some Western scholars have even looked down upon the Indian tradition as an embodiment of mysticism, occultism, supernatural, and intuition bereft of logical thinking. It is highly regretful that British empiricist John Lock made a caricature of Indian philosophy without any proper inquiry into its subject matter. In his *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1947), he tries to belittle the wisdom of Indian philosophy by writing,

> Had the poor Indian philosopher (who imagined that the earth also wanted something to bear it up) but thought of this word substance he needed not to have been at the trouble to find an elephant to support it, and a tortoise to support his elephant; the word substance would have done it effectively. (Locke, Book II, Chapter XIII, p.19)

It is not right to pass such sweeping judgments about any particularly philosophical system. When we assess the philosophical standpoint of classical empiricists like Locke, we come to know that their philosophical mooring, like those of the Indian school of

Carvaka, are rooted in crude sense-experience. Unfortunately, this philosophical wisdom is so limited that it cannot grasp anything that transcends the limits of sense-experience. As a result of this limitation, Locke's empiricism could not construct higher-order-metaphysical philosophy. Unfortunately, this philosophical legacy continues to dominate Western epistemology. Knowledge may start with sense-experience, but does not arise out of sense experience. Similarly, the activity of philosophizing starts with common-sense, but does not end there.

One of the reasons for the skepticism by the West of Indian knowledge may be traced to an attitude of understanding Indian philosophy to be essentially and accurately spiritual or meditative, and only concerning itself with the Ultimate Reality (Lal, 1978, p.xii). Unlike the West's bifurcation of philosophy from spirituality (human consciousness from unconscious cosmos) (Tarnas, 1991, p. 377), all Indian philosophical systems deal with the spiritual aspect, excepting Carvaka. The peculiarity of Indian thought is its concern for "inwardness", the sub or super-consciousness, which is Atman realization, translated generally as "self-realization" (Muirhead, 1929, p. 528). In fact, what is aimed at in religion is also available in Indian epistemology. In India, there is no separated branch called theology. Though philosophy is universal, each culture in the world has developed a philosophy characteristic of its values. Any philosophy "is subject to the influences of race and culture. Each nation has its own characteristic mentally, its particular intellectual bent" (Radhakrishnan, 1999, Vol 1, p. 23). Indian educational philosophy has had its foundation in the metaphysical as well as axiological outlook of its culture. In other words, the nature of the life Indians come to live is, to a great extent, determined by their cultural and belief systems. Since India's culture has been based on

its religious tradition, its epistemology has not been a separate branch of activity; it has been a part of the total outlook along with its social beliefs about God, mankind and the universe. Hence, for this reason, we do not find specific books on the subject of knowledge in its ancient culture. One would have to search for the principles of educational philosophy in the sacred texts such as the Upanisads. The development of the Upanisadic tradition has been a development of the philosophy of inwardness (Raju, 1985, p. 262). "If Whitehead claims that what is called Western philosophy is nothing but a series of footnotes to Plato and Aristotle, then what is called Indian philosophy can be characterized as a series of footnotes to the Upanisads" (Raju, 1971, p.15). Irrespective of its affinity to monism or pluralism, realism or idealism Indian philosophy is oriented towards inwardness. The ancient Indian seers were not interested in the knowledge for knowledge sake, but in the knowledge of the highest kind, which is approached by means of inwardness. The activity of inwardness is essentially religious and religious activity is the activity of Atman-realization, which is translated generally as "self-realization" (Raju, 1982. p. 21). In the words of another great Indian philosopher, Swami Vivekananda, "religion is in the inner most core of knowledge" (Vivekananda, 1997, p. 161).

Religion for Indians is certainly not a revealed religion like Christianity (Moore, 1959, p. 185). Religion is a way of life based on reflection of experience, which is nothing but the philosophy of life. It is a form of intuition and reflection on one's life and being, i.e., inwardness. In other words, religion is not divorced from philosophy, but the ultimate truth realized in experience. "Religion to a Hindu is not, however, the western conception of faith, nor does it merely comprise dogmas and creeds. It is rather *anubhuti* - realization and experience" (Prabhananda, 1997, p. 1). This experience cannot

be acquired by the senses or by the intellect as it is transcendental. In the scale of consciousness it belongs to the fourth, or the last *Turiya* state-the transcendental state-which may be described as our innate or inner consciousness. Though it is present in all, people do not recognize it in their state of ignorance.

The relationship between philosophy and knowledge and between philosophy and religion in India is ultimately intertwined; the former two pointing to the goal of life and the latter to the means for its realization. Knowledge has always been regarded in India "as a source of illumination and power, which transforms and ennobles our nature by the progressive and harmonious development of our physical, mental, intellectual and spiritual power and faculties"(Altekar, 1957, p. 8). Such a view of considering knowledge as potentially divine in nature may make it somewhat difficult for present day students of philosophy to classify Indian knowledge as belonging to either the realm of epistemology or of theology. However, the difficulty in preserving such a unity between the spiritual and practical point of this view is ultimately based on values. If we attribute this difficulty more to do with the difference of culture and how we assign values, then we widen our awareness of knowledge in general and better our understanding of Indian knowledge specifically. With the Indian approach, it becomes necessary to consider "the experience", as integral because it is accepted as a part of the total development of knowledge. Indian theories of knowledge recognize and keep room for the notion of its interrelationship (Banerjee, 1974, p. 307). One of the objectives of this dissertation is to emphasize this point of unity among the theories in question—a unity long overlooked or at the very least insufficiently acknowledged.

1.7 Basis of Knowledge in India

Indian philosophy works within a metaphysically accepted framework which has been constructed over the centuries. For most people, modernity represents an age of logic and reason, not of dogma and blind faith. With the advent of modern educational systems, there is a reluctance to accept any statements that lack logical support. Therefore, since modern India has been heavily influenced by the scientific temperament of the West, its contemporary philosophy can be considered nothing more than western thought in Indian garb. It is in the area of traditional Indian philosophy that one finds disagreement and controversy on a number of broad issues concerning what we know and how we know between the occidental and "truly" Indian thinkers. An example to illustrate these differences is that the latter is based upon the spiritual conceptions of humankind and the universe one inhabits, while the former is secular and devoid of the sense of the sacred. It is precisely for this reason, according to those following traditional Indian thought that "knowledge in the West has become problematic as it has lost its true purpose. It is skeptical and in some cases agnostic to any level of knowledge other than scientific methodology and has thereby brought confusion to the realm of human knowledge" (Singh, B., 1976, p. 73). Even some Western scholars view the trend toward modernity – the trend away from dogma or faith, and towards reason and rationality- with great concern. Houston Smith writes in *Beyond the Post-Modern Mind* (1992), "A defining feature of modernity is loss of transcendence. The sense of the sacred has declined. Phrases like 'the death of God" and "eclipse of God" would have been inconceivable in early days...the chief assailant has been modern science" (Smith, p. 145). The unfortunate outcome of this development, however, is that the values embraced by living and leading a spiritual life also eroded simultaneously, and base

instincts, such as greed, power, and materialism grips the culture. This dichotomy polarizes Western society into two extreme camps - one remaining focused on afterlife and the other seeking instant gratification This is certainly not meant to imply that only the spiritual path will lead us to a path of healthy values, but this path is one that has been proven.

Although this problem is becoming a serous issue in Western countries, Eastern cultures are no longer immune to it. As Indians themselves are migrating to other countries like Canada, local stresses are straining their families. The contemporary problems in the Lower Mainland have to be brought into the picture as some aspects of these issues are global in nature, some are locality-specific and others intensely personal. The consequences of the gradual shift from "joint-family" to "nuclear-family" to "no-family" has become a subject of detailed study and research by local leaders (UNITED, 2004). These problems have been with us for a long time, but have been exacerbated in recent times. There are no easy solutions and certainly no panacea. However, a reference to Indian spirituality, culture, and its worldview would uniquely equip us to deal with many of these problems because of its rich philosophy and individuals' affinity to their history. Contemporary community leaders and those genuinely concerned with these issues can draw much from these historical lessons and make a difference. Such action would be a strong reactionary position to the current turmoil and confusion created by the crumbling of the Indian family structure. It is not meant to imply that spiritual values are the answer and that science is to be blamed for the loss of spirituality. In fact, what is being posited is a focus in shifting from the old spirituality, based on dogma and orthodoxy to a new spirituality that is not necessarily emanating out of our temples and

mosques. This new spirituality should grow out of our cities, streets, and families in the form of empathy, brotherhood and mutual respect. The high priests of this new spirituality are today's community activists. Carl Sagan suggested that, "A religion old or new, that stresses the magnificence of the universe revealed by modern science, might be able to draw forth reserves of reverence and awe hardly tapped by the conventional faiths" (Sagan, 1994, p. 94).

For the modern mind, spirituality should be neither just faith nor pure materialism. To draw forth the "reserves of reverence and awe", a revitalized spirituality must be multi-dimensional and multi-layered. It must blend a new faith with logic, and must cast a more critical eye toward the relationship between humans and all other living beings. In Western thought, the word, "God" is generally used to denote a reality that is both creative and personal. It has been described as the uncaused cause of everything, but also as a personal deity to whom one might pray and be heard (Coward, 1983, p. 329). Moving to Indian thought, the situation is rather different. At the level of popular religion, there are thousands of gods and goddesses, each with a particular sphere of influence, either geographical or in terms of a particular aspect of life. But beyond this, there is the concept of Brahman. This denotes Ultimate Reality, a reality which includes the whole universe with its multiplicity of gods and goddesses. Brahman is seen as the invisible reality within and around everything while all the other gods represent a limited aspect of Brahman (Ibid, p.67).

In addition to the Brahman, Indian epistemology also references the Atman which is the knowing subject and pervades in us all. It is that which knows, experiences and illuminates objects of knowledge. The Brhadaranyaka Upanisad states it is "the spirit

consisting of knowledge (*vijnanamaya*), shining within the heart" (Brhadaranyaka Upanisad IV 3.7 f.). The Atman is the subject, but never the object of knowledge. The Brhadaranyaka further adds:

> You cannot see the seer of seeing, you cannot hear the hearer of hearing, you cannot think the thinker of thinking, you cannot understand the understander of understanding. It is your self, which is in all things. (www.celextel.org, Brhadaranyaka Upanisad III, 4.2.)

Additionally, the Atman is epistemologically referenced as,

> The light that enlightens when the sun, the moon, stars and fire are extinguished, the light of lights, which is here within men and at the same time shines under heaven. It is the supreme light into which the soul enters in deep sleep, and issues forth its own form. (www.celextel.org, Chandogya Upanisad VIII 3.4; VIII. 12.3)

Thus, as has been stated above we find that the Atman is incomprehensible and by its very nature cannot be perceived, "not by speech, not by mind, not by sight can it be apprehended (www.celextel.org, Kath Upanisad II. 3.12). "It is not a datum of experience, not an object, though all objects are of it" (Radhakrishnan, 1999, p. 158). Our senses, reason, and intuition, - all exist for the soul and serve a purpose. It is the soul that is immanent in them and gives them life and meaning. However, these cannot be identified with the soul, for it transcends them all. "All knowledge exists as it were" (www.celextel.org, Brhadaranyaka Upanisad IV, 4.19). There is really no plurality.

With regard to the Upanisad texts which deny the multiplicity of objects and assert the unity of all things, I do not mean to deny the reality of the many objects. Only that in all of them there is the same Brahman on which all are dependent for existence, just as all gold articles are dependent on gold. What the Upanisads deny is the independence of objects, not their dependent existence (Iyangar, 1961, vol. 1, 1.1.1).

In light of the discussion so far, we understand Brahman as the eternal principle as realized in the world as a whole, and Atman as the utmost essence of one's own soul. Indian philosophy represents them as relating to the physical universe in the same manner in which our soul is related to the body. The two terms are used synonymously (Sharma, 1979, p. 26). This means that there is nothing else between the principle underlying the world as a whole, and that which forms the essence of man. When we look at the idea of the self, we have to consider this essence, which is very much different from the West. There are two selves; one which is determined by its caste or place in the social order and the other is the Atman, which is the self in its relationship to the whole, expressed as Brahman. The Upanisads argue that Brahman and Atman are in fact one. The fundamental self is co-existent with the reality of the universe. Another way to put this would be to say that there is a single reality; when it manifest globally it is called Brahman, but when it manifest in the self it is called Atman.

> Atman is myself within the heart, smaller than a grain of rice or a barley of corn, or a grain of millet; this is myself within my heart, greater than the earth, greater than the atmosphere, greater than the sky, greater than all the worlds. (www.celextel.org, Chandogya Upanisad Book III, 14. 3-5)

The identification and deep sense of mystery of Atman and Brahman is very significant as it is the Indian solution for the search of how we come to know what we know. It is the identification of Atman and Brahman that constitutes the essential teaching of the Upanisads, which are philosophical colloquies (like Plato's dialogues) and act as the mines where we may quarry for our philosophical ideas. It is in the Upanisads that we find all the teachings recognized as fundamental to Indian philosophy: the concepts of *moska* (liberation), *dharma* (merit or duty), and *karma* (action and reaction),

and *artha (*wealth*)*, and the concept and synthesis of Brahman with the Atman. This is the essence of each entity and being in the phenomenal world.

Of the two types of sacred writings in India: *smrti* and *sruti*, the Upanisads are strictly speaking part of the *sruti* tradition of a more philosophical perspective. *Sruti* means "heard", "perceived", "understood", or "cognized" [3] and refers to the habit of the ancient seers going off to live in the forests, where they become so evolved in consciousness that they could "hear" or "cognize" the truths of the Ultimate Reality. The Upanisads epitomize this and ask questions about the nature of the self and Ultimate Reality in a very focused way and reflect a certain reaction against the polytheism, indeed the theism of the Vedas and are much more inward, mystical and meditative (Herman, 1976, p.137). There is an emphasis, not on correct ritualistic practices in terms of sacrificial ritual, chants, incantations and the like, but on intuitive knowledge and introspection; knowledge becomes the central issue, not rituals. Such knowledge is called *vidya* or *jnana*, and the way of knowledge - *jnana marga* – becomes all important in the Vedantic message which is still considered an established path to *moksa* in Hinduism today (Ibid, p.124). The path of *jnana* is essentially an individualist one. The role of the guru is to equip the pupil to stand on his own two feet and journey independently, "transcending the mind with the help of the mind" (Mehta, 1990, p.3).

Thus, the knowledge of which the Upanisads speak of is not knowledge *about* the world, but *about* Ultimate Realty. It is knowledge of a deeper kind - intuitive knowledge, which can only be experienced at the deeper levels of the self. Though it can be "taught"

---

[3] www.geocities.com/profvk/sruti.html

or "learned", the gurus could only point their pupils in the right direction. However, without an inner intuitive "experience", the knowledge of Ultimate Reality was impossible (Gough, 1979, p. 45). It is not difficult to see, then, why the teachings related to such knowledge were esoteric. Pupils had to be at the right point of their personal evolution to be able to experience such truths in the depths of their being. There is no subject or object in the experience of such knowledge and the egoistic "I" which we associate with receiving knowledge is not evident. Knowledge of this kind exists in a characterless being, not a personality and is a realization of truth in the sense of "seeing of it with the soul and a total living in it with the power of the inner being" (Aurobindo, 1986, p. 3). In many ways, there is certain simplicity about such knowledge, and yet it is very profound. We spend our lives busying ourselves with all sorts of things and have little time to reflect, to just be still, and to accept life for that moment. Brahman is not divorced from life but is in the essence of every moment and can be experienced as such. There are moments in life when the individual transcends ordinary existence and experience -just for a few moments- the kind of oneness of existence known by Brahman.

This traditional Indian viewpoint, however, offers a perspective on the many sources of knowledge that are mostly accepted on mere faith based on certain dogmas that cannot be set aside much less altered. There are actually as many as eighteen means of achieving knowledge (Bosanquet, 1911, p. 285), and in each method of engaged philosophical investigation, we find that Indian thinkers are bound to certain presuppositions which they believe are true such as the ideal of Brahman, Atman, and the four ends of life for an individual: *dharma, karma, artha,* and *moksa* all which are integrally related (Banerjee, 1974, p. 46).

A brief discussion of the four ends is in order. *Moksa* is the chief aim of life. To find one's true self one must be released from the ego, which is the cause of all unrest. The high sense of humanity is to aspire to universality through the mind, reason and heart by way of reincarnation, the idea that at the end of each life, the individual is born again in another existence in order to carry on one's evolutionary path. All life and matter, even knowledge, is considered cyclical; evident in the cycles of the planets, of nature, and of humankind. Apart from the physical body and the breath that makes one live, the individual is composed of two elements. One is the personality, the ego *(jivatman)*, and the other is the Brahman which is called the Atman. The ego is our personality; it is constantly changing and is the sum total of all our experiences in life, all our desires and aversions, our conscious and subconscious characteristics. The Atman on the other hand is the part of us that which Brahman and cannot change since it is permanent and which like Brahman is Absolute. The Atman does not reincarnate at all. It is simply there in everything and manifests itself in the world. It is the ego which is subject to reincarnation (*samsara*) and the next reincarnation will depend entirely on the personality of an individual in the present existence. What determines the state of the individual in the next experience is *karma*. *Karma* means "action" and refers not only to actions undertaken by the body, but also to those undertaken by the mind. It is action and re-action for Hindus believe that all actions produce results and it is this theory that is behind the concept of *samsara*. Each person chooses how to act or think, so each person's karma is his or her own and equally so are the results of those choices belong to that person. The Brhadaranyaka Upanisad describes this very well. "An individual creates for himself his next life as a result of his desires, hopes, aspirations, failures, disappointments,

achievements and actions performed during this life of his" (Organ, 1974, p. 15). So if choices are good, then the results in the next life will be good. Inversely the same would apply. If actions are very bad, then a person may actually devolve and degenerate into a lower form as an animal. Westerners sometime see the operation of *karma* as fatalistic, but it is far from this. While an individual can do nothing about the *karma* he or she must reap, all of an individual's future lives are affected by present actions, thoughts and words: we shape our own future. While it can be suggested by some that this was used by the ancients as a means to maintain the status quo in India with regard to poverty, one can counter-claim that responsibility and care for the poor and to others is one of the means by which good *karma* can be promoted. Applying this to the present day dis-enfranchised Indo-Canadian youth, it can be used as a vehicle to advance ideas which imbibe positive values.

Thus, in order to achieve *kama* (self-actualization), it is important to live life according to *dharma,* what is right. This involves doing what is right for the individual, the family, the community and also for the universe itself. *Dharma* is a cosmic norm and if one goes against the cosmic norm or the norm for the community, bad *karma* can result. But *dharma* also affects the future, for each individual has his or her own *dharmic* path dependent on the *karma* which has been accumulated. So one's *dharmic* path in the next life is the one necessary to bring to fruition all the results of past *karma* and is thus right for the individual, even though it may be a difficult path as many of young Indo-Canadian men have experienced. This second end of life can give coherence and direction to the activities of life. It tells us that while our life is for our own satisfaction, it is more essentially for the community and most of all for the universal self which exists

in each of us and all beings. According to Radhakrishnan, "ethical life is the means to freedom as well as its expressions on earth" (McDermott, 1977, p. 191). *Artha*, another end, is related to wealth and material being of a person, but not in the sense of excessiveness as many youth tend to believe and adhere to. It is considered in the context of the body that encompasses the *Atman*. Many diseases and disorders, intellectual, moral and social break out rendering a weak body, hence a weak mind. The final and ultimate aim of every Hindu is that the endless cycle of *samsara* will be over, and there will be no necessity to be reincarnated. This can only happen when there is no *karma* to cause an individual to be reincarnated because there is no egotistic self, no "I" to reap any results. This is *moksa,* liberation from the cycle of *samsara.* It is thus achieved when the ego loses its good and bad *karma* and has no *karma* at all. As with knowledge, to achieve this *kama,* Hindus have many paths; it is not something which can be achieved in only one way, but each and every path is within us to be discovered. When a person realizes *moksa*, the *Atman* –the part of the individual which is *Brahman* – merges with *Brahman* like the river merges in to the sea. The ego is gone and only pure *Atman*, which is *Brahman*, remains. The subject and object are one.

This view is not only comprehensive but also refreshingly different from the sets of arguments "for" or "against" our inner or intuitive sense. The four ends of life point to the different sides of human nature; the instinctive and the economic, the intellectual and the spiritual, all making up Brahman, as the ultimate cosmic principle or the source of the whole universe which is all comprehensive. From the view of certainty, such a conception aids in explaining the origin of knowledge. Though there is nothing that compels us to regard Brahman as omniscient knowledge that pervades in us as actually

existing, however, there is no logical absurdity in denying it. It is the establishment of the intuitive character of knowledge and the clearing away of the uncertainty about its existence that are accomplished when one identifies oneself with Atman.

1.8 Aim of Knowledge in India

In Indian philosophy, knowledge is not regarded as a science of ascertaining and acquiring facts and information but as the quest of values. Fundamentally, it is the science of salvation (*moksa)*. The Upanisads in themselves do not aim at the logical validity of knowledge. Their main objective is to show the path to liberation, and knowledge is a means to that end. The highest knowledge is the knowledge of Brahman, the knowledge that leads to liberation (Victor, 1992, p. 101). The avowed futility of the Vedic lore stress upon the same print repeatedly; knowledge is not valued on the merit of logical validity but as a means for ethical progress (Radhakrishnan, 1948, II, 46).

Given that the ultimate aim in Indian thought is knowledge of Brahman in the deepest, intuitive sense and the fusion of the self with the Self, Atman with Brahman, it is easy to see why one single lifetime would be insufficient for such realization. The self evolves through an immense period in time, reincarnating from one existence to the next. Experience of Atman may be glimpsed in one lifetime but life has to be lived entirely rooted in Atman, and the Jiva, the egoistic self, has to be obliterated. Every egotistic thought is a karmic cause and must have a result, which accrues to the "I" that caused it. All individuals make sense of the world by differentiating between this and that, that is to say they are perpetuating the illusionary distinctions of delusion (*maya)* by living life in a world of dualities in which they make egotistic choices and judgments. It is often the more subtle choice of the mind, even of the subconscious, which causes the individual to

perpetuate desire or aversion for one thing as opposed to another. But, as stated, Brahman is beyond dualities, at a point where that ceases to exist. For an Indian to come to that point where the dualities of life disappear and all is one, they need to reincarnate which Indian thought views as the logical evolution for each person (Lott, 1980, p. 7). So a person must transcend the results of his own actions. *Dharma* helps a person evolve to this point by placing the individual in the life situation most suited to his or her stage of evolution (caste).

The goal in Indian thought is to lose the kind of *karma* which attaches itself to the egotistical self. The Indian sages taught that one can experience the unity of all existence and become Brahman. This experience is *sat, cit and ananda* (truth, pure consciousness, and bliss)(Chennakesavan, 1976, p. 92). Like the case by which we experience dreamless sleep, moksa does not have to be found, it is already there in oneself. The sages taught that through the path of knowledge, withdrawal of the senses and meditative practice, the evolution of the self could reach the point of realization of Brahman (Ibid, p. 25). To know Brahman is to know the knowledge that resides in oneself. Knowledge is one of the constituents on the path to *moksa* and is experienced when the Self is released from bondage, our ignorant state of *ajnana* (perverted knowledge) (Ibid, p. 114).

The ideal of attaining *moksa* is not simply a matter of intellectual conviction but the real goal of like. As Max Muller puts it, knowledge was recommended in India "for the highest purpose that man can strive after in this life" (Muller, 2004, p. 370). *Moksa*, though varying in conception from one system to the other, is a common culmination for all the Indian schools of thought with a solitary exception of the Carvaka materialism which does not believe in any spiritual life (Sharma, 1979, p.44). This is all due to the

fact that the search for knowledge does not originate in India with a feeling of awe and curiosity probing into the facts of nature. It arises with a quest for prescribing some practical discipline which could lead man to eternal bliss by eradicating the evils of life.

The various schools of Indian knowledge all express similar sentiments. The Sankhya system promises complete cessation of all sorrows as its chief aim (www.celextel.org, Sankhyakarika, 1). The Yoga is entirely devoted to the attainment of Kaivalya. Gautama in his Nyayasutra enumerates sixteen categories and asserts that their knowledge would lead to the highest purpose, i.e. liberation (Gautama, 1913, 1.1.1). In the category of *pyamey* (object), only those objects that are important in the attainment of salvation are enumerated (Bhattacharya, 1987, p. 428). The Nyaya-Vaisesika system begins with the interpretation of *dharma* as the means for the attainment of the worldly as well as transcendental knowledge (www.celextel.org, Vaisesikassutra, 1.1). Mimamasa, the strict devotee of the Vedas, does the same by explaining *dharma* as an injunction of the Vedas (www.celextel.org, Mimamsasutra 1.1). Buddhism and Jainism also express the same; for example, Buddhists aim at nirvana, i.e. appeasement of passions, which are the chains that keep the soul in bondage (www.celextel.org, Abhidharmakosa IV 127). A discussion on the Jain theory of knowledge is also dominated with the same spirit. The spiritual development achieved through the removal of karmic matter is the main theme of the Jain scriptures (www.celextel.org, Uttaradhyayanasuta XXVIII, 36). The path for acquiring knowledge and spiritual progress, aiming at the final goal of liberation is the central tone of the Agamaz (Ibid, XXIX).

Liberation is effected by the knowledge of the Atman. The emancipation is already there as the "hidden treasure of gold in the field". True knowledge is itself the

deliverance or emancipation in all its fullness. "He who knows himself as Atman, the first principle of things, is by that very knowledge free from all desires, for he knows everything in himself, and there is nothing outside of himself for him to continue to know" (www.celextel.org, Bhagavadgita, VI, 19).

The ignorance of reality, delusion, is generally recognized by the Upanisads as the cause of bondage and suffering (Chatterjee, 1950, p. 18). The goal of life envisaged in the Upanisads, therefore, is the revelation of the emancipation from the bondage through true knowledge of reality. True knowledge about the reality is the experiential realization of the truth as expressed in the Chandogya Upanisad which says,

> Just as those who do not know the field, walk again and again over the hidden treasure of gold and do not find it, even so all creatures here go day after day into the Brahma-world and yet do not find it, for they are carried away by untruth. (Iyangar, 1996, *VIII. 3.2*)

To put it in other terms, the realization of the ultimate unity of the individual self with the Ultimate Reality is the liberation (www.celextel.org, Brhadaranyaka Upanisad IV 4.9; Munaka Upanisad III. 2.9) This unity is something produced by enlightenment, therefore, it is not properly a new beginning, but only a perception of that as it has existed from eternity, though hitherto concealed from us.

The worldview expressed so far has been discussed in regards to the source and aim of Indian philosophy and knowledge. Since the viewpoints taken up are interrelated, there are bound to be repetition here and there. However, one need not consider them as repetitious; they may be treated as the links of a chain holding it together. Indian philosophers in general adopt a holistic approach which has many common or shared ideas, ideals and attitudes, as well as methods.

1.9 Classification of Knowledge

All sources of Indian knowledge can be classified into two categories: *Para* (higher) and *apara* (lower). *Apara* knowledge consists of all the empirical sciences and our perceptual comprehension. (Victor 1992, p .56). It involves our senses viz sight, hearing, touch, smell and taste which are organ based, while the mind- the intermediary - is a non-organ based quasi sense. A combination of shedding appropriate knowledge-obscuring karma and stimulation of our senses by general sources (the object of study) results in our becoming conscious of the object (the known). This knowledge is considered illusionary and unreliable and could easily be corrupted or distorted by several factors such as our sense, the state of the object, and the state of the knower itself. Contrary to this, knowledge through the former (*para*) avenues is at a higher extra-sensory, metaphysical, or innate level and is likely to be less distorted. These avenues are perfect as in the case of intuition. *Para* knowledge is what has not been heard of becomes heard of, what has not been thought of becomes thought of, what has not been understood becomes understood. It is the knowledge of the self or that of self-realization and is considered pure knowledge of reality and of the truth (www.celextel.org, Brhadaranyaka Upanisad III.4.2).

While trying to understand the Indian conception of knowledge we should bear in mind the distinction which the Mundake Upanisad makes between the *para* and *apara* forms:

> ...two kinds of knowledge are to be known, as indeed, the knowers of Brahman declare – the higher as well as the lower. Of these, the lower is the Rg-Veda, the Yajur Veda, the Sama Veda, the Atharva Veda, such as Phonetics, Ritual, Grammar, Etymology, Metrics and Astrology. And the higher is that by which the soul is apprehended. (Iyangar, Mundaka Upanisad 1.1.5)

The *para* form of knowledge has come to be termed as *paramartha darsana*, i.e. the ultimate and final knowledge and *apara* form as *vyavahara darsana*, i.e., earthly or pragmatic point of view. The higher level has been variously called *brahmajnana, brahma-saksatkara, paramartha-jnana*, etc. as it is a state in which one experiences one's identity with Brahman (Murti, 1974, p. 243). It is an intuitive state where our consciousness is transcended. Attaining this intuitive vision in the universe and in man is regarded as the *summum bonum* of man (Kattackal, 1980, p. 75). The *vyavahara*-state or *apara-vidya* experience, on the other hand, is the ordinary waking state. This is the plane of sight, taste, smell, and hearing senses (pleasure, pain, ego-consciousness, activities and so on). Compared to the intuitive state, this is a lower state or an inferior state of knowledge. It is variously called the state of *avidya* (ignorance), *ajana* (perverted knowledge), *maya* (delusion), etc. as it is the level of our worldly knowledge (op. cit., pp. 312-314).

The Upanisads, truly speaking, do not represent any system of philosophy. They are stray thoughts which are connected together in certain groups. There is diversity of thoughts current in the Upanisads, yet they propound a doctrine about reality that our "inmost self is of the nature of pure consciousness, which is the ground of all our experiences and which is at the same time the inner controller of all the diverse powers of nature and in the living bodies which can not however, have any further independent reality from it" (Das Gupta, 1993, p. 19). This dominant spirit reveals a reality, which is the ultimate inner essence of a person and is different from what we ordinarily understand by the soul, the five senses, and the vital power of the mind. The Brhadaranyaka positively declares that, this innermost self, is the Brahman (Ibid, p. 39). It is pure

perceiving consciousness, but it is surprising to note that no attempt has ever been made in these works to explain how the diverse experiences which make our psychological experiences and are surely material can spring from this purely perceiving conciseness. We have been informed that the universe is identical with Brahman or it has come out of Brahman, but surprisingly enough, it has been omitted through what operations the innermost self can be regarded as the sources or cause of this manifold world. All these have been left beyond the approach of thought though some mystic explanations have been offered to fill in the vacuum of thought. Anticipating further difficulties from the intelligent reader or inquirer some illustrations have also been offered to explain what seems to be truly mystical for us. The Upanisads probably do not deny the reality of the visible world, nevertheless, they have not failed to emphasize that the basic reality does not consist in the phenomena or the appearances of the world but is ascribed to the concept of Brahman which alone is the ultimate reality in their view. The Upanisads have played an important role in liberating philosophical thought from most of the elaborate rationalism and sense-ridden modern outlook. They have pointed out to a reality which grounds the whole universe in our innermost self and in which reside all experiences, appearances, etc. In the end, this innate sense of knowing and being is beyond intelligence, the five senses and the ordinarily understood soul. Thus, "it is difficult to label the Upanisadic idealism, either as subjective idealism or objective idealism or as absolute idealism" (Ibid, p. 52) according to the terms applied in Western systems of philosophy. However, Fitche, who is supposed to be one of the greatest philosophers of subjective idealism in the West, holds that "all experience is ego-centered and is self-conscious" (Chennakesavan, 1976, p. 108). The Ego of Fitche is as much individual as

universal and therefore is very easy to consider his doctrine as a sample of similar idealism. The interpretative elements as those effortlessly applied in the Upanisads make it rather simple to provide analogous idealism to that of Fitche.

1.10 The Six Schools of Thought

The various schools or systems of Indian thought who subscribe to the Upanisadic philosophy of knowledge can be, for simplicity sake, divided into two broad classes: the orthodox and the heterodox. To the first group belong the six chief systems: Nyaya, Vaisesika, Sankhya, Yoga, Vedanta and Mimamsa. These are considered orthodox, not because they believe in God, but because they accept the authority of religious historic Vedic texts, as the ultimate source of enlightenment (Pappu, 1982, p. 25). The Sankhya and the Mimamsa do not believe in God, yet they are supposed to be orthodox because they believe in the testimony of the Vedas. To the second group belong the chief schools of the materialists like the Carvakas, as mentioned, along with the Buddhist and the Jains who do not accept the authority of the Vedas, and by extension the Upanisads. Though there is diversity and criticism of each other, these schools of thought share so many things in common that one can easily realize that they are the products of one and the same soil albeit cultivated by different seers. All of them attempt to understand the nature of the self and its relation to the Supreme and the cosmos. They all are united in the common belief that the nature of the Ultimate Reality is realized only when the right knowledge of ones' own self dawns upon them. They all begin with the conviction that there is ignorance and suffering in the world which can be and must be rid of, thus, comes the self-realization of true knowledge (Ibid, p.26).

The heterodox Indian schools of thought emphasize that any character of knowledge should be implicitly accepted due to their belief of the revealing nature of knowledge (Rao, 1998, p. 101). *Pramanas,* instruments of valid knowledge, are considered means of knowledge as well as means of proof. An analysis of Indian knowledge indicates that this was due to a need on the part of Indian thinkers to find means of proof for their beliefs which they had come to hold, for their own satisfaction, but still more, for producing conviction in others (Prasad, 1998, p. 10). The six schools of orthodox Indian thought accept at least two of the following six sources of knowledge: perception, inference, testimony, comparison, postulation, and non-cognition apprehension. Vaiseiska accepts the first two, Samkhya and Yoga accept the first three, Nayaya the first four, Mimamsa the first five and Vedanta all six sources of the aforementioned. Though each school has their own fundamental interpretations of a single Reality, they are all mutually complementary. They dealt progressively with the questions of the means and methods of knowledge, the fundamental categories of objective reality, the process of cosmic evolution including the microcosm of the individual person, and the method of experiencing the Reality personally (Raju, 1971, p. 35).

The Vedanta is the last school of philosophy among the well-known six, who are commonly referred to as the *Sad Darsana.* The Vedanta (last of the Vedas) school is the epitome of Indian philosophical thought and has had the most pervasive influence on Indian art, culture, and civilization. It has had three major interpreters viz., Sankara, Ramanju and Madhwa, of which Sankara, the most uncompromising monist has had the greatest vogue by reason of his being most representative of the vision of the true Indian

mind. The Vedanta Sutra (*Nyaya*) with Upanisad (*sruti)* and the Bhagavad-Gita (*smriti*) constitute the *Prasthanatrayi*, the three original sources of the Vedanta philosophy. (Varma, 1969, p.41). The Vedanta is in short, despite continuous misinterpretations and criticism, the purest well of Indian thought. Whether we shall call it by that name is not terrifically important as Vedanta is the purest idealist philosophy and represents the very heart of Hindu thought (Ibid, p. 49).

The spiritual experiences of the Vedanta are subject to logical criticism and systematic analysis from the other systems of Indian philosophy. Buddhism and Jainism have been inaccurately considered to be against the Vedic vision of Reality. In actuality, they revolted only against excessive Vedic ceremonialism and ritualism (Moore, 1959, p. 45). Reality is One and Many, with different systems of philosophy, including Jainism and Buddhism, emphasizing its particular aspects as part of whole truth. "Almost all the Indian systems are unanimous in holding that the true aim of philosophy consists in the soul's perceiving its intrinsic nature in an act of direct and immediate intuition (*saksatkara*) (Singh, B., 1976, p.3). The same soul that brings us wisdom renews and expresses itself through instruments more rich and suited to comprehend the complex and ever enlarging conditions of everyday human life and experience.

Though the many schools of Indian thought may differ on the number of *pramanas*, they have recognized and asserted that knowledge can be derived from many different sources. The aforementioned *pramanas* are all sources of valid knowledge, coming within the ken of Indian epistemology which has evolved its own methods of inquiry. Indian epistemology has formulated a hierarchical and coherent system for determining the nature of reality through various sources of knowledge. Indian logic

consists of both content and form. The content is supplied by the cognitive organs (*gian indris*) but the formal rules of logic which are used as tests for determining the validity of knowledge in the West, as is the case of perception and reason, are not always applicable or utilized (Op. cit., p. 29).

A brief discussion is needed to bring out the relative value given in Indian thought to the pramanas of perception and logic, as it will be the two sources of comparison with Western epistemology. The secular affairs of a person's temporal life may be well regulated by *apara* knowledge such as perception and logic. According to the Indian view, most of the *pramanas*, which have been mentioned, can be traced to perceptual and rational knowledge (Rao, 1982, p.1). On the basis of previous perceptual knowledge we can make inferences. Therefore, one can postulate that all inductive generalizations about the world can be derived from perceptual knowledge and serve as the cornerstone of inductive reasoning. Though it has been used as an independent means and source of valid knowledge by Western philosophers, reason also plays an instrumental but different role in Indian epistemology. Reason is a means of *justifying* perceptual knowledge and *cultivating* a higher metaphysical experience (Op. cit., p. 177). An enlightened person develops a vault of discriminative rational knowledge which enables him/her to distinguish between truth and falsehood and also compliments the receiver's other sources of knowledge. In apprehending knowledge, the sense organs and intellect are vital, however, knowledge is not strictly *partakh*-derived from sense, nor it is *pramana*-based on argument or reason alone, but a synthesis of mind and soul. "As a mode of knowledge, intuition should have to be related to non-intuitive thought" (Mohanty, 1993, p. 30). This "complete" knowledge arises from an intimate mystical fusion of mind and

reality, an experience which is an integration of our perceptual equipment along with our other faculties that assists us in understanding the complete truth.

Perception, though a source of empirical knowledge, is of no avail for establishing the truth or otherwise in the fields of metaphysics, and knowledge based on reason can help us build logical constructs through reflective ventures about the ontological realm of existence. It, however, cannot dispel the ignorance (*bharam*) due to the delusion (*maya*) caused by knowledge-obscuring karma. As well, it cannot dispel our doubts, nor can such knowledge provide us with immediate experience of absolute sureness. The use of perception and reason for understanding the world around us is definitely helpful but it can never investigate the metaphysical realm, which transcends this temporal world. It is stressed again that neither perception nor logic can remove *bharam* caused by *maya*. These means of knowledge are useful for regulating common sense on the temporal level of reality and are useful for creating intellectual understanding of the ways of conduct and the nature of reality but the truth or complete knowledge cannot be realized through these pramanas (Op. cit., p. 124). For comprehending the complete truth one has to turn to the higher pramanas such as verbal testimony (*sabda*) which draws their authority from revelation and intuition, i.e., an immediate experience.

The intuitive knowledge of gurus, rishis and saints, who have had an immediate experience are in a position to enlighten others with the flame of knowledge. This pramana, *sabda*, is given significant importance and high value as a means of acquiring knowledge in Indian thought (Singh, J., 1990, p.45). The verbal testimony here draws its authority from intuitive knowledge gained from the scriptures and revelation of the truth. *Sabda* here may be understood in two senses: one as a pramana for guiding one's life,

and the other as *nam* (name) for the Guru's word, in the form of a mantra (Ibid, p. 106). Only after practicing *jap* (contemplations) and mediation on the *nam* can one dispel *bharam* or *maya* and attain enlightenment. Therefore, *sabda* has a dual function of giving us knowledge or instructions so that we can lead a life which is conducive for progress towards attainment of *moksa* and second, to give us *nam* so that we can attain a state of equipoise - a state which is attained when self-realization of the truth takes place. It needs to be clarified that the concept of *sabda* may reveal the truth which may otherwise not be attainable through the other two lower pramanas of perception and reason. *Sabda* does not contradict the knowledge gained through common experience, but actually complements it. The point that is brought home by the above is that Indian epistemology recognizes the fact that the truth revealed by *sabda* does not go against the common experience, as both the levels of knowledge, empirical and transcendental, are functioning as a coherent system within the whole reality (Ibid, p.101).

The value given to s*abda* in Indian thought naturally comes to influence the practical aspects one one's life. Indians value the words and advice of mystic saints and have full faith and belief than the knowledge of these rishis is intuitively derived from a communion with a higher metaphysical force and that these words carry much more wisdom and deeper truth that the knowledge of worldly-wise and rich people (Ibid, p. 49). It is true that the "word" of the teacher is received through the perceptive process. But perception here implies intent listening, followed by reflection, recollection, faith, intuitive insight.

> The argumentative condition of the concentrated mind is that wherein it gets engrossed in the thoughts of the word and its meaning and understanding. When the mind apprehends a word and meditates upon its

form and means and also upon the understanding of the two, it loses itself in the thing. (Ibid, p. 100)

This knowledge in fact refers to the *para* form: it is total consciousness or total realization that belongs to the region of a "mystical experience". When referring to "hearing", it should not be taken to imply ordinary hearing, but "listening" to the very voice of reality (i.e. *sabda*), by "revealing" its inner essence represented by the embodiment of the human soul or the microcosm (Dalvi, 2004, p. 3). One must strive to "perceive" the truth enshrined in one's self. Even today, in modern-day Indian society, this epistemological view is operative and influences the practical life of the Indian masses and has affected the development and transformation of the course of Indian knowledge (Op.cit,. p. 192).

It is only when this inner wisdom lights up the self that the truth is revealed at the level of the world of fact and form in which one lives and acts, and the other level which illuminates the soul. Here the path of action (*karma*) can guide the knower to develop a multi-lateral outlook. At this level, the individual self, free from illusion, ceases to exist as a separate entity. Dualism disappears and the self synthesizes all information leading to realization or *darsana*. This method of self-realization does not place exclusive emphasis and reliance upon any one of the sources of knowledge. A start may be made with the adoption of one source, or combining the elements of the other two, perception and logic, side by side. Development of all the three aspects of reason, sense and this "inner wisdom" in concert synthesizes in the personality of the person harmony, equipoise and a state of abiding bliss (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 106).

Intuitive knowledge itself is a phenomenon that can be realized only when we outgrow the limitations of the traditional framework of our cognition. This becomes

feasible when our intellect aligns itself with our soul and sensibility. Success in this venture may not at all easy as continued practice and discipline can allow us to experience that metaphysical source. This higher level of knowledge can arise or is the outcome of rigorous discipline of self-control and mental concentration which may require special effort and training. Enlightenment is not as direct and simple as natural perception is. The methodology of the practice of meditation is essentially a contemplative way to self-realization of our intuitive essence. This "path of knowledge" was duly evolved from the traditional yoga whose goal was self-realization, or the identity with Brahman. (Bishop, 1975, p. 242).

The main features and stages of the classical *Yoga* may be summarized in the following way; *Practice*. The process starts with the initiation of an individual at the hands of a guru or a spiritual guide, who recommends a constant repetition of a mantra with an aim to produce a state of concentration on the sound (*sabda*), or object of thought. (Coster, 1957, p. 200). The truth is already present in one's self but must be helped out. Most people are subject to flashes of intuition, and will admit them if challenged; but few have paused to examine intuition and recognize it as differing in quality, in kind, from ordinary mental experience. This method caters for the need of thoughtful reflection. The knower feels a presence in their heart and through this knowledge they know the eternal self. It is essentially an affective state of the mind, without any strong element of rationalization in it. Intellect or wisdom is not at a discount in this method of meditation, but is rather upheld by it. This self-realization is possible to any person through practice. Yoga not only produces harmony but is sensible and rational and when adopted for realization, can be considered equivalent to intuition (Ibid, p. 231).

Spontaneous mediation: The highest state of *yoga* is that where contemplation become automatic. This state of effortless meditation is not so easy to attain in a life full of distractions. It, nevertheless, is claimed to be within the reach of everyone who aspires to it and vigorously pursues it (Lal, 1978, p. 219). It should be kept well in mind that revelation does not mean that an idea should arise in the mind of a person who sets themself to ponder over a thing as, for instance, poets having thought out half a verse seek the other half in their minds and ponder over the other half. This is not revelation but is the result of reflection. When people reflect upon something good or bad, a corresponding idea arises in their minds. With revelation, on the other, an energy link unites the individual with their inner essence, affording one an experience of Aurobindo's *Purusottam* (supermind). Here one's psychology gets transformed. This "intuition brings to man those brilliant messages which are the beginnings of his higher knowledge" and is perhaps the highest kind of experience that the seeker can hope to attain (Op. cit., p.335).

Traditional *yoga* in part synthesizes some of intuition's important features. True knowledge is that which emerges from the heart and regulates and trains the body and mind, and manifests in practice. No type of knowledge, however, elementary arrives at its climax without practice. For instance, we have always known that baking bread is perfectly easy and involves no great art. All that is needed is that after kneading the flour and preparing the dough, we should divide it into balls of proper size and pressing each ball between our hands should spread it out and place it on a properly heated pan, and move it about till it is heated into bread. But this is only academically instructive. When without practical experience we start the process of baking, our first difficulty is to prepare the dough in its proper condition so that it neither becomes too hard nor remains

too soft. Even if we succeed in preparing the dough after much effort and weariness, the bread that we bake may be partly burnt and partly unbaked with lumps all over of irregular shape, despite our observation of the process of baking over a period of our lifetime. Thus relying upon our bare knowledge, which we have never practiced, we would suffer a loss of a quantity of flour. If such is the case of our academic knowledge in elementary matters, then how can we rely solely on our knowledge without any practical experience in matters of great importance?

Indian theories advocating this self-revealing aspect of knowledge make a distinction between transcendental consciousness that is neither subject nor object and empirical consciousness which arises through the relation of sense organs to external things. While empirical consciousness can be an object of consciousness, transcendental consciousness is the ultimate principle of revelation and does not stand in need of an ulterior principle for its own revelation (Radhakrishnan, 1999, p. 395). Pure consciousness is self-luminous. The foundational knowledge is not what just appears in the shape of metal states in individual minds empirically determined but rather what pre-suppositionally stands behind such states. This knowledge subsists by itself independently of empirical determination and objective reference. Empirical knowledge appears and disappears while transcendental knowledge does not. It is eternal, self-revealing and cannot remain uncertified. If the foundational knowledge is uncertified, the object itself remains uncertified though it may be true. Foundational knowledge cannot be certified by a secondary knowledge nor can it be self-certified in the sense of being an object to itself. It is not revealed by anything other than itself (Hiriyanna, 1951, p. 307).

This self-revealing aspect of intuitive knowledge may be criticized on the following grounds. Firstly, it leaves no room for doubt. If knowledge is self-revealing, then there can be no doubt about any perceived knowledge. In response, one can argue that doubt only infects the object of knowledge. Consider the sentence, "is that distinct object a tree or a man?" This sentence is equivalent to "Is that distant object known by me a tree or man?" – which clearly proves that we have no doubt about knowledge of the object but only about the object of knowledge. It can also be argued that the theory leaves no room for illusion because if knowledge is self-revealing, illusory knowledge will reveal itself as such and consequently there would be no scope for illusion. Again, illusion infects only the object of knowledge, not the knowledge of object. In the classic case of the snake-rope illusion, for example, the knowledge of the same is not denied. It is shown by the way in which illusion is corrected. When one says, "It is a rope, not a snake", what one really means to say is "what I have known is a rope, not the snake" (Sinha, 1965, p. 89). The third objection may be that it makes the proposition "I know that I know" quite useless as it implies two realms of consciousness. But "I know that I know" does not convey the existence of two consciousnesses, only of one consciousness, and if this proposition is stated in this form, it is only to satisfy the opponents of the self-revealing argument, not its exponents. The crux of the matter is that intuitive comprehension is not known in the way which an object is known.

> Consciousness and object are felt in two different attitudes. Consciousness is felt in such a way that this feeling stands identical with the consciousness that is felt. The former attitude may be called subjective or inward, and the latter objective is outward. The subjective attitude is not introspection, if by introspection is meant an awareness which is consciousness for its object. For as just noted, the being of consciousness is identical with the feeling of it. (Bhattacharya, 1987, p.1)

In its comprehension, there is no distinction between the revealing from the revealed, though such distinction is inevitable when we are to express in it language.

1.11 Summary

To sum up the discussion on Indian epistemology in general and intuitive knowledge specifically, I have referenced the Upanisads which on the whole regard Brahman as an objective intelligence that develops itself through the diverse forms of the manifold world until it attains the status of conscious intelligence in people. The Upanisads maintain that the spirit can be realized through the mystic intuition, moral elevation and cessation of all desires. The spirit of the Upanisads has nothing to do with reason and is connected with dialectical law evolving itself into two forms of subjective and objective categories. The self in the Upanisads is self-complete and, as Spinoza articulates, the Infinite Reality is *the causa sui*, i.e. "that human knowledge does not point to a divine reality but is itself that reality"(Tarnas, 1991, p. 351). Matter and thought are considered as its two attributes and stand independent of each other. Individual minds exist, however, they are only derivatives of the Infinite Substance, and therefore limited and imperfect but the Upanisadic idealism does not concur with the Spinozian concept. The Upanisads express truth to reside in the innermost self of mankind and doubtlessly upholds a *causa sui* for the reality but it is not its fundamental character, as it is indescribable and beyond apprehension. It is pure consciousness and pure bliss. The Upanisads maintain that the inner self as the highest reality is like an undisturbed and dreamless sleep. It is from this state that all experiences and all objective phenomena are known in the form of two levels of knowledge; one, that which is confined to what is given in common experience,- *apara* viz., empirical, relating to the temporal and secular

affairs of man; and the other - *para* which transcends this seemingly empirical reality. For our understanding of and for our common sense dealings with the empirical reality, there is no requirement to have complete knowledge of the objects of our experience. Common sense knowledge is sufficient to make our life workable and practicable at this level reality. For this sort of existence, perception and reason form good enough means for valid knowledge. But to have complete knowledge of reality, another *pramana* is required which is the intuitive sense. By way of conclusion, I must remark that in Indian epistemology, intuitive knowledge is given high value as one of the means to the attainment of complete knowledge and considered immensely valuable along with the other *pramanas* such as logic and perception. All are important.

It will be clear by now that epistemology is a vast area in Hindu educational philosophy and includes many differences within it, both obvious and subtle. My main contention regarding intuitive knowledge is that it must not be regarded as an alternative to reason, nor must it be regarded as a way to knowledge adopted in mystical experience as against philosophical endeavour. By establishing the relationship between our intuition, senses, and reason on a more satisfactory basis, a serious bias toward intuitive thought can be removed. The tradition carried on by Indian philosophers is a synthesized approach; rationalism and humanism, realism and idealism, diversity in unity and harmony of the individual and society. The basic characteristic of Indian educational philosophy is rooted in its culture. Indian epistemology integrates life, always keeping its eye on totality: its physical, mental, and metaphysical aspects are all interrelated.

While laying emphasis upon the inner self and our intuitive knowledge, Indian thinkers also recognize the value of rationalism and experience as equally important

sources of knowledge as all are expressions of the Ultimate Reality, the total self. For our contemporary times, a scheme of knowledge formulating both ancient Indian wisdom and modern Western scientific thought can be synthesized. Traditional Indian thought can be re-interpreted as to harmonize with "scientific" knowledge and make it relevant for the modern age. In the words of Sri Aurobindo "the aim and principles of true education are not certainly to ignore modern truth and knowledge but to appreciate the foundations of our own belief, our own mind and own spirit" (Aurobindo, 1952, p. 4). An integrated approach in knowledge would lead to a synthesis and harmony between the sciences and humanities. The philosophy that would emerge out of this would be a healthy fusion of forces between extremes of spirituality and asceticism and rationalism. This does not mean escapism nor is it not opposed to logic, but would provide inspiration and hope not only to the East but to the West as it seeks to set free the educand from the shackles of materialistic bondage and a wayward path.

An idealistic and integrated philosophy is possible. While pointing out the limitations of empirical and rational methods in philosophy and accepting their limited value, contemporary Indian philosophers have utilized the intuitive method which can delve deep into the recesses of the Spirit. To realize this, one must utilize methods that delve into their inner self, reaching deep to find the soul. "Reason works under the limitation of senses and categories of mind, whereas intuition is free from all these influences. Intuition is integral knowledge which absorbs sense-experience and reason and transcends their limitations" (Sinha, 1965, p. 126.) Thus, one must advocate the use of an integrated method in order to arrive at a coherent and comprehensive theory not only of knowledge but also of human nature. It is the integrated aspect, a multi-sided

scheme of knowledge that is physical, mental, social, moral and spiritual, in its outlook. If successful, it would almost lead to a revolution about the aims, ideas, and curriculum in the field of education.

With respect to the aims in the sphere of knowledge, Indian philosophers have come to believe that the curriculum and teaching methods should achieve a mixture of the past with the present as to take advantage of the merits of each. There is a growing inclination in modern Indian in favor of integration in educational philosophy. This is the reason in spite of incorporating scientific knowledge, one finds elements of almost all the traditional methods in even the most recent methods of teaching (Sahu, 2002, p. 49). This is the eclectic tendency in Indian knowledge which can also be called the tendency of compromise. Undoubtedly, the eclectic tendency is better than a one sided view because it is more comprehensive, liberal, and extensive.

Indian philosophy often looks to an eclectic perspective to discover the inner kernel which is often missed by the pure and social sciences. It emphasizes the spiritual aspect as an integrating principle; a theory of human nature and knowledge that includes physical, moral and religious thought in tune to the spirit of Indian culture. The spokesman for this philosophy, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, has had a wide and deep knowledge of Western science, art, literature and culture and first hand contact with the West. It is hence that his theory of intuition is compared with the views of the West resulting in an integrated viewpoint. Thus, one finds a meeting of ancient Indian ideals and modern western principles, individualism and socialism in his writing. Dr. Radhakrishnan draws his inspiration from ancient scriptures, the Upanisads, and blends Eastern and Western educational philosophy by reconciling modern thought with ancient

ideals (McDermatt, 1997, p. 37). In his process of re-formulation, traditional Indian epistemological thought can be succinctly interpreted in the light of modern science and western ideology.

1.12 Radhakrishnan and the Doctrine of Intuition

Radhakrishnan was a renowned Indian philosopher who held the capacity as a professor and vice-chancellor in Eastern and Western universities. Along with his wide experience of the field of education, Radhakrishnan had extensive learning and deep insight into Indian and Western philosophy, ancient and contemporary. Therefore, he is undoubtedly one of the most qualified persons to speak about Indian epistemology with authority. His views are found scattered in various books he wrote such as *The philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore, The Bhagavad-Gita,* and *Eastern religion and Western thought* to name but a few.

According to Radhakrishnan's epistemology, the inner Spirit, which is the ground of all being with which a person's whole being is united at the end of their journey, contributes to their sense of knowing. "When buddhi vijani intelligence has its being turned towards the self', then Radhakrishnan says, "it develops intuition or true knowledge" (Ibid, p. 153). In other words, Radhakrishnan presents his theory of innate knowledge by way of spiritual knowledge, which is not merely perceptual or conceptual, but logical insight. He thought the rationalists were not correct in giving supreme importance to reason in the sense of critical intelligence. However, he also knew that the drift of the modern age and its ruling methods of work support a scientific method. Dr. Radhakrishnan, however, did not agree on relying solely on the rational method because he knew that whose who adopt the method and conception of an exact and descriptive

science are obliged to raise the further question of the limitations and value of scientific knowledge. In his view:

> While the theories of science are useful as tools for the control of nature they cannot be said to reveal what reality is. Electrons and protons do not clear up the mystery of realty. Besides, the soul cannot be treated as a mathematical equation. Our deepest convictions, for which we are sometimes willing to die, are not the results of rational calculation. The decisive experience of personal life cannot be comprehended in formulas. Their driving power is in those urgent and intimate contacts with realty which convey to us deep certainties which transform our lives. Even scientific rationalism requires us to admit the actuality of such experiences and the phenomenal and incomplete character of merely scientific knowledge. The fact of this integrated or intuitive knowledge tells us that we are not helplessly shut out from an insight into reality by the constitution of our mind. (Ibid, p. 51)

Radhakrishnan states,

> The whole course of Hindu philosophy is a continuous confirmation of the truth that insight does not come through analytical intellect alone, though it is accessible to the human mind in its integrality (Ibid, p. 52).

He further adds,

> Intuitive knowledge, however, is not opposed to intellectual knowledge as Bergson sometimes makes us believe. In intuitive knowledge, intellect plays a considerable part. If intuition is unsupported by intellect, it will lapse into self-satisfied obscurantism. Intuition assumes the continuity and unity of all experience. Intuition tells us that the idea is not merely an idea but a fact." (Ibid, p. 53)

Radhakrishnan was an idealist philosopher and an advocate of ancient Indian Vedanta philosophy. This is very much clear from his works, *The Hindu View of Life, Brahmasutra,* and *An Idealistic View of Life.* He defined philosophy as a combination of reflection and intuition (Radhakrishnan, 1980 p. 15-16). According to him the aim of philosophy is to search that synthesis which may include all knowledge: reason, logic, faith, and experience. In his epistemology, Radhakrishnan acknowledged the value of

both reason and experience, but strongly acclaimed the value of intuitive knowledge. Radhakrishnan viewed intuitive knowledge as the highest knowledge which is gained by total self awareness and is much higher than any other experience gained by any part of man's being (Ibid, p.47). His philosophy has been rightly interpreted as an integrated scheme where an intuitive experience finds place for every other type of experience.

My purpose is to examine Radhakrishnan's answer to the question which he addressed himself in *An Idealistic View of Life* (*AIVL),* namely "is there or is there not knowledge which by its nature cannot be expressed in propositions and is yet trustworthy" (Ibid, p. 100). Radhakrishnan believed that there could be a kind of non-propositional knowledge, which is trustworthy. He contrasted intellect with intuition and set up a defense of intuitive knowledge over rational knowledge.

One may without much ado agree with Radhakrishnan when he says that cognitive experience resulting in knowledge "is produced in three ways". These three modes of acquisition of knowledge are "sense experience, discursive reasoning and intuitive apprehension" (Ibid, p. 105). Radhakrishnan's pramana theory begins by stating that since sense experience is the result of the contact of our senses with the objects, it initially leads us to perceptual knowledge of the external world. It provides us data for our investigation in the natural sciences. Sense experience is foundational to our knowledge. Radhakrishnan expresses the importance of sense experience since "everything is known to us only through experience. Even such an abstract science as mathematics is based on the experience of stated regularities" (Radhakrishnan, 1955 p. 98). "Logical knowledge" is what Radhakrishnan in *An Idealist View of Life* calls rational knowledge and is arrived at by the process of analysis and synthesis. Perceptual

knowledge and logical knowledge are related to one another in that "that data supplied to us by perception are analyzed and the results of analysis yield a more systematic knowledge of the objects perceived" (Ibid, p. 106). Since logical knowledge is the product of our reflection, analysis and synthesis, it is qualitatively more distinct than our ideas of sense qualities or our perceptual knowledge. Logical knowledge "pieces together the scattered data, interprets for us the life we harbour and thus frees the soul from the body…(it) pays great attention to the logic of ideas, draws inferences, suggest explanations and formulates theories which would introduce some order into shapeless mass of unrelated facts" (Radhakrishnan, 1999, p. 672). Since logical knowledge deduces relations between our observations, or whatever is given to us and articulates these relations, it is "indirect and symbolic in its character" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p.6). There is an intimate relationship between logical or conceptual knowledge and perceptual knowledge. The organic relationship between the two can best be expressed in Kant's words, "percepts without concepts are blind, concepts without percepts are empty" (Smith, p. 75). These two kinds of knowledge are grouped under the category of knowledge which we acquire by intellect. Knowledge acquired by intellect is useful to us because "it helps us to handle and control the object and its workings", and it helps us to "acquire for practical purpose a control over our environment" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p.106). It also "enables us to know the conditions of the world in which we live and to control them to our ends" (Ibid, p.115). Since "we cannot act successfully without knowing properly intellect is useful for action" (Ibid, p.115). Thus, he says it is necessary for us to have rational knowledge. This kind of knowledge keeps evolving with time in order to meet our changing needs and situations. It is not static, but dynamic. Its

contents vary with "our perceptions, our interests and our capacities" (Ibid, p.113). There is hardly any philosopher who will disagree with this "intellectual kind of knowledge" which comprises perceptual and conceptual knowledge, i.e. the synthesis of knowledge through the avenues of sense-experience and discursive or "logical reasoning'. This intellectual kind of knowledge meets the conditions of knowledge laid down and is the product of a cognitive situation.

Radhakrishnan, however, feels that knowledge based on sense experience and discursive reasoning or logic is inadequate. It does not give us the object in itself but tells us only of the qualities which the object has in common with others and provides us with a description of its relation (Ibid, p.121). According to him, "intellectual knowledge is inadequate, partial, fragmentary but not false. It fails to reveal the truth in its fullness...It can be trusted within limits" (Schlipp, 1952, Philosophy of Radhakrishnan, p. 792). Intellectual knowledge by the operation of analysis reduces the object to previously known elements, i.e. to those it has in common with others. It "breaks up its unity into systems of separate terms and relations" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p.134). This, according to Radhakrishnan results in "the falsification of the real" (Ibid, p.134). He does not only separate intellectual knowledge on the above grounds but also considers it as inadequate. He considers it inadequate because "whatever be the object, physical or non-physical, intellect goes about it, but does not take us to the heart of it" (Ibid, p.106). Unfortunately, Radhakrishnan does not explain what it would be to go to the heart of the matter. The other reasons why he considers "intellectual knowledge" to be inadequate is it is a "mixture of truth and error, for (in it) practical motives interfere with the unclouded thought" (Ibid, p.124). Finally, "intellectual knowledge" is considered to be inadequate

by Radhakrishnan because it is not able to comprehend the experience like love, music, moments of intense joy and acute suffering, parental affection, truth, beauty and goodness, the idea of the universal, etc. To understand each one of these, he argues that one has to necessarily undergo those experiences (Ibid, p.142).

Because of these shortcomings of this intellectual or rational knowledge, Radhakrishnan argues in favor of intuitive knowledge, i.e. knowledge based on intuition or what he calls in the *Recovery of Faith* and in *Fragments of a Confession* integrated insight. In *Reply to Critics*, he categorically states "intuition is of two kinds, perceptual knowledge and integrated insight. Personally, I use intuition for integrated knowledge"(Op. cit. p. 792). Whereas Bergson defines intuition as that "by means of which we project ourselves into an object in order to achieve identification with that element which is unique and which is expressible" (Friedlande, 1958, p. 214), Radhakrishnan describes it "as a power more superior than intellect by which we become aware of the real in its intimate individuality, and not merely in its superficial or discernible aspects" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p.100). However, he defines intuition in terms of an "integrated experience" (Ibid, p. 200), the exercise of consciousness as a whole" (Schillp, p.188), and treats it as "the extension of perception to regions beyond sense" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p.193). According to him "intuition" is used to cover all cognitive process which has a directness or immediacy, i.e. all non-inferential cognition. What we know by inference or hearsay is not "intuitive knowledge" (Op. cit., p.791). Intuition gives us the knowledge of things "in their uniqueness, in their indefeasible reality" and is "vital in character since it is expressive of life and not merely logical

analysis" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p.115). It "makes us see things as they are, as unique individuals" (Ibid, p.138).

Intuitive knowledge "is different from the conceptual, a knowledge by which we see things as they are, as unique individuals and not as members of a class or units in a crowd. It is non-sensuous, immediate knowledge" (Ibid, p.109). Knowledge based on intuition "arises from an intimate fusion of mind with reality. It is knowledge by being and not by senses or symbols. It is a state of mind...it belongs to the structure of the mind" (Ibid, p.109). Intuitive knowledge "brings into activity not merely a portion of a conscious being, sense or reason but the whole. It also reveals to us not abstractions but the reality in its integrity" (Schillp, p. 791). This kind of knowledge puts us "in touch with actual being" Radhakrishnan describes it as the highest knowledge which "transcends the distinction of subject" (Ibid, p. 792). It is due to this knowledge "that logical knowledge is possible because this highest knowledge is ever present. Thus, it can only be accepted as foundational". According to him, "intuitive knowledge is a self-subsistent mode of consciousness different from the intellectual or the perceptual. Whereas perception gives us the outward properties of an object, and intellect discerns the laws of which an object is an instance, intuition gives depths, meaning, character to the object" (Schillp, p. 792). Intuitive knowledge is 'felt and affirmed and not derived or explained" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 105). It is a set of "convictions arising out of a fullness of life in a spontaneous way, more akin to sense than to imagination or intellect and more inevitable than either" (Ibid, p. 142). Intuitive knowledge "discloses to us eternity, timelessness in which time and history are included" (Schillp, p. 792). Knowledge based on intuition is "an intense and close, communion between the knower

and the known". In intuitive apprehension "there is complete fusion of the subject and the object" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 138). In intuitive knowledge, "man ceased to be an impartial spectator. His whole being is at work, not merely the power of observation and inference. It is knowledge by coincidence. Being and knowing are different aspects of one experience. It is something most immediate and most profound" (Schillp, p. 792). "It is an awareness of the truth of things by identity. We become one with the truth, one with the object of knowledge" (Op. cit. ,p.138). Having said all this, however, Radhakrishnan is silent about how this fusion of mind resulting in intuitive knowledge takes place.

Radhakrishnan's preference for intuition, however, is not without difficulties. He admits as Bergson does, that the intellect is needed to express the intuitive experience in intelligible and cognitively significant terms. In his *Reply to Critics* he wrote,

> The immediacy of intuitive knowledge can be mediated thorough intellectual definition and analysis. We use intellect to test the validity of intuition and communicate them to others. Intuition and intellect are complementary. We have to recognize that intuition transcends the conceptual expressions as reality and does not fit into categories." (Schillp, p. 794)

One may reasonably say that Radhakrishnan agreed with Schopenhauer when the later said that in intuition there is a "sudden transition from the common knowledge of particular things to the knowledge of ideas...The knowledge takes place suddenly; for knowledge breaks free from the service of the will" (Schopenhauer, 1883, p.34). For Radhakrishnan "the successful practice of intuition requires previous study and assimilation of a multitude of facts and laws, intuition arises out of a matrix of rationality" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 139). Whereas for Schopenhauer intuition will emerge "if (a person) gives the whole power of his mind to perception, sinks himself

entirely in this, and lets his whole consciousness be filled with quiet contemplation" (Op. cit, p.34), Schopenhauer is certain that the nature of genius consists in a pre-eminent capacity for such contemplation (Ibid, p. 36). However, unlike Schopenhauer, Radhakrishnan does not seem to be sure about the nature of persons who can have intuitive knowledge. For in *Indian Philosophy, Vol. 1,* (1999) he says that, "man has the faculty of individual thought or mystic intuition by which he transcends the distinction of intellect and solves the riddle of reason" (p. 36), implying thereby that every person has the capacity of intuition. But in the very next sentence he says "the chosen spirits scale the highest peak of thought and intuits reality" (Ibid, p. 36) implying thereby that intuitive knowledge is only for a few. One of the characteristics of knowledge is that anyone with some training is in principle able to grasp it. Would we be justified in calling intuitive knowledge, which is expressed by a few through their own special methods and which in principle cannot be adopted by all, knowledge? To grasp it, one has to be either a genius or a chosen spirit. By its very nature, intuitive knowledge is to be experienced; it is to be felt. In it, "there is something incommensurable, eluding expression in words" (Radhikrishnan, 1980, p. 148). Like many other great truths of philosophy it is not to be "proven but seen" (Ibid, p. 150). As we know, communicability, an expression in words, or articulation is an integral part of a cognitive situation. But, an intuitive experience should not be rejected as a valid form of genuine knowledge just on that ground. Similarly, Radhakrishnan tries to save such a rejection of intuitive knowledge by saying that "certainty and not communicability is the truest test of knowledge and intuitive experience has the sense of assurance or certainty and is therefore a species of knowledge" (Ibid, p. 114).

Let us not examine the possibility of proving its certainty. Let us not begin by rejecting *a priori* that a claim based on intuition is not knowledge. On the contrary let us begin by admitting that some knowledge say about self or values is obtained by a special intuition. Now this discovery has to be articulated in propositions to see whether they are verified or confused by experience. This step is accepted by Radhakrishnan when he says that "knowledge when acquired must be thrown into logical form and we are obliged to adapt the language of logic, since only logic has a communicable language" (Ibid, p. 140). But if we ask Radhakrishnan to put the intuitive knowledge into propositions all that he is able to produce is propositions like "I have a direct and immediate experience of the fact that the universe is good, spiritual and in some sense personal" (Ibid, p. 109). He then tries to hide his failure to produce the kind of propositions we are asking him to produce by saying that intuitive knowledge is "the only truth we have; all else is inferential" (Ibid, p. 109). He goes on to add that "we cannot verify it and therefore cannot dispute it as it transcends the partial truths of the divided mind; the intellectual and the sensuous". It is a kind of knowledge that is to be proved on our pulses". We need a very special subjective method of proving it because "it is the only kind of absolute knowledge" which "is possible only when the individual is fully alive and balanced". It can be seen "truly only when our inner being is harmonized" since it represents "the ultimate vision of our profoundest being" (Ibid, p. 114). To get over this charge of subjectivity, Radhakrishnan tries to universalize his personal experience which is embedded in "I have direct and immediate experience of the fact that the universe is good, spiritual and in some way personal" by leaping back and forth from "I statements" to "we statements" (Ibid, p. 140). This leap, however, is unjustified since the "I

statements" may or may not be of psychological interest, which is capable of neither test nor proof, and which has no scientific or intellectual interest or importance. All that one can say of it is that it may or may not be true. But the use of the "we statements" "implies that "we" means "everyone" and further that the direct perception of everyone that the universe is good is a guarantee that the universe is good (Ibid, p. 139).

The criterion of certainty available to an intuitionist is their own saying that they know that they had a particular intuition. There is no other public check, no other way of certifying their claim other than their saying so. By definition, whatever one claims to be true has to be true. But just as "the guarantee by the company of its products is no proof that the product is sound; the guarantee of intrinsic certainty has to be in terms of some well known common standard" (Lehrer, 1978, p. 132). Depending solely upon the claim and authority of the persons who experience the intuitive knowledge for certainty, it would be like buying several copies of the same newspaper to confirm a news item.

Radhakrishnan fails to produce any intelligible propositions, other than dogmatically asserting and reasserting time and time again, propositions containing terms like "self-luminous", "direct", "unmediated", "spiritual", "self-contained", etc. along with statements like, "intuition is not logical but supra-logical, it is the wisdom gained by the whole spirit which is above any more fragment thereof, be it feeling or intellect" (Radhikrishnan, 1980, p. 116) or "intuition supervenes on intellectual analysis" (Ibid, p. 117). The use of such terms and statements leads one to say that his intuition has not revealed to him any facts. For if he really had acquired any information, he would be able to express it. He would be able to indicate in some way or other how the genuineness of his discovery might be empirically determined. Radhakrishnan seems to be in a dilemma

here when he admits, "the immediacy of intuitive knowledge can be mediated through intellectual definition and analysis. We use intellect to test the validity of intuition and communicate them to others. Intuition and intellect are complementary" (Tillich, 1963, p. 253). His failure to supply criteria for verification of intuitive knowledge and communicate to others the contents of intuitive knowledge make him say in the very next sentence, "we have of course to recognize that intuition transcends the conceptual expressions as reality does not fit into categories" (Schilpp, Philosophy of Radhakrishnan, p. 794). Not only is he not able to articulate what he knows, he also does not devise an empirical test to validate his knowledge so much so that he does not have any method to know whether what he calls knowledge today was the same what he called knowledge at a past occasion. As to providing a justification to others for his claims of knowledge, no criterion of justification has been provided. Thereby, Radhakrishnan fails to show that intuitive experience is available for anyone other than his own satisfaction and that intuitive experience is a cognitive state at all. So when an intuitionist describes their vision to us, they may at the most be describing to us their mental state. Radhakrishnan's description of the experience may be interesting from the psychological point of view but it does not in any way confirm that there is such a thing as intuitive knowledge, at least according to Western rules of logic.

Radhakrishnan may dismiss this attack on his theory of intuitive knowledge by saying "No logical knowledge is possible which is not under laid by intuitive knowledge (Radhikrishnan, 1980, p. 124). He defends intuitive knowledge by saying "if intuitive knowledge does not supply us with universal major premises, which we can neither question nor establish, our life will come to an end" (Ibid, p. 155) and by arguing that the

validity of the highest idea is not derived from the sense or proved by logic. It is self established by the reason of "the soul's trust in itself" (Ibid, p. 124) therefore, neither the condition of knowledge nor the components of a cognitive situation are applicable to intuitive knowledge. But then what has he been trying to do throughout? Has he not been trying to find a logical account of intuition and intuitive knowledge? Surprisingly, in *Recovery of Faith*, Radhakrishnan quotes only the first part of what Wittgenstein says in *Tractatus logico-philosophicus* (TLP) 6.52, namely, that "we feel that even when all possible scientific questions have been answered, the problems of life remain completely untouched" (Radhakrishnan, 1955, p. 76). He tries to prove that Wittgenstein also supports his thesis about the undemonstrability of the knowledge of ultimate values, i.e. things known by intuition of objective science. If he had quoted TLP 6.52 in its entirety, one would easily see that Wittgenstein does not support Radhakrishnan's doctrine, rather he says that nothing is left outside the ambit of science. The full text reads,

> We feel that even when all possible scientific questions have been answered, the problems of life remain completely untouched. Of course there are often no questions left, and this itself is the answer. (Wittgenstein, 1994, 6.52)

Rather than misrepresenting Wittgenstein by quoting half of his thought it would have been better if Radhakrishnan had heeded Wittgenstein's advice in TLP 7, "What we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence" (Wittgenstein, 1994). It would have saved him so much of something, which is logically incommunicable.

In our scientific discourse, of course, we do not answer the question, "How do you know?' by saying that we know by intuition. That is meaningless but in all such cases where we say that something is known by intuition is not saying how it is known. The addition of the explanatory phrase serves only to deny an explanation. When we say

"we know by intuition", the expression by intuition is not meant to indicate the source from which we know but it only expresses that we have no explanation with respect to the source of knowledge. So in answering "we know by intuition" we have said nothing whatsoever regarding the source of our knowledge. To say that there can be direct, unmediated experiences without substantiating it would be misleading. All experience is processed through, organized by and makes itself available to us in extremely complex epistemological ways, this notion of unmediated experience without qualification seems if not self-contradictory, at best empty.

1.13 Radhakrishnan's Philosophy of Mind

Radhakrishnan's view of intuitive knowledge is based on the facts supported by Hindu philosophy. His epistemology (theory of intuition) and metaphysics (theory of Brahman-Atman) are mutually dependent. The case of intuition presupposes the reality of the Absolute or Brahman, the intuition of which is the source and object of all knowledge. Similarly, the metaphysical claims for Brahman, the level of reality which it includes, presupposes the great religious personalities, such as the seers (or rishis) whose insights are expressed in the Upanisads, have overcome *maya* or the appearance of reality and have achieved self-realization. According to Radhakrishnan, recognition of the intuitive experience is precisely what contrasts Indian from Western philosophy. By valuing intuition over intellect, he is attempting to reverse what he considers the characteristically Western perspective (Radhikrishnan, 1980, p. 129). Radhakrishnan's theory of intuition and theory of Brahman-Atman originated from and are related to his concepts of an integrated system of knowledge, spirituality, and ethics as witnessed by

his statements that, "Knowledge of reality is to be won by spiritual effort. One can not think ones' way into reality, but can only live it" (Ibid, 128).

Let me conclude this critique regarding the place of intuition in Radhakrishnan's philosophy of mind. He lays great stress and holds with great conviction "that intuitive insight is a greater light in the abstruse problems of philosophy than logical understanding" (Ibid, p. 100). But all that Radhakrishnan claims to have done in his work is to try to explain that insight in the modern idiom. My contention, however, is that Indian epistemology has a place for an intuitive "vision of truth in logical argument and proof" (Ibid, p. 100). The theories of Indian philosophy which I have discussed in Part 1 commonly share a different approach to knowledge. The very awareness that there actually exists another approach may break the acknowledged insularity of certain contemporary Western philosophers and the consequent narrow view of the origins of knowledge which they have (Tarnas, 1991, p.1). The viability and desirability of an integrated approach, if established along Western lines of logic, may be seen as a powerful critique of the two philosophical approaches, rationalism and empiricism, and the associated view of knowledge which issue from them.

PART TWO – WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

2.1 Introduction

In the case of a complex philosophical/epistemological theme like that of intuitive knowledge, I believe that one of the most useful ways of clarifying the nature of the fundamental issue at stake is an analytical investigation. This would bring out the development of "the problem" and reveal the process of refinement and precise formulation and give our philosophical investigation a new perspective on the systematic question at stake. In the case of an argument for recognition of intuitive knowledge in the West, there is a rich tradition of debate from days of the pre-Socratic period onwards. Thus, accordingly Chapter 1 of this Part will attempt this kind of analytical clarification. In the following chapters, I have selectively focused on certain major stages in the development of the intuitive doctrine, namely the discussions in the philosophy of Rene Descartes and John Locke. Having made a thorough study of intuition in Radhakrishnan's thoughts and finding what was living and what was lacking may be a way of incorporating the particular views of philosophers Jean Piaget, Edmund Hussurl and Ludwig Wittgenstein. This would thereby provide a complete theory of intuition, at least one which may stand up to the scrutiny of "Western" standards.

On the basis of the preceding discussion of "the problem", I formulate a new perspective of the concept of intuitive knowledge which I call an "Integrated theory of Intuition". This reformulation is inspired by the Radhakrishnan paradigm of metaphysical thinking which I critiqued earlier as confusing and contentious. When the question is

posed as to what is intuitive knowledge, the Upanisadic formulations lead us to the axiological, theological, and metaphysical level where the transcendental formulations operate. What is lacking is the "scientific" aspect, which will provide the "critical" meaning of intuition. Apart from giving us a new form to the doctrine, it will also give us a clue to the possibility of developing a "critical" conception of intuition. In this chapter, the innate element in knowing is seen in terms of the *a priori* synthesis which is the ground of the possibility of knowledge. The concept of intuitive knowledge presently has a purely epistemic significance as standing for the synthetic activity of the mind which is the very presupposition and grounds of knowledge. This conception gets further support and precision in terms of three philosophical developments: Phenomenology, Genetic-epistemology, and Analytical philosophy. These developments bear upon different aspects of the metaphysical mode of thinking; they give precision and a more exact form to the basic ideas of Radhakrishnan. These contemporarily movements of thought, therefore, bring out the relevance of our present philosophical concern, but also suggest possibilities of further development.

Although these discussions form an important and integrated part of the structure of my research, I have been selective. My intention is not to provide an exhaustive and normatively complete account, I am conscious that I have not provided a discussion of the history of the problem in all its details and complexities. Even within the limits of a particular thinker or period, I do not aim to cover all aspects of the particular treatment of the problem. For example, with reference to Western epistemology, I will touch only on Locke and Descartes. Similarly, while dealing with Indian epistemology, I concentrated only on Radhakrishnan. But perhaps the most important limitation is in terms of using

ancient Indian philosophy. These limitations and selectivity is due to the basic intention of the project, namely, to bring out the "metaphysical" character of intuition and the values we assign to our modes of knowing. Thus, I focus on the "critical" meaning of the doctrine concerning the grounds of the possibility of knowledge. Naturally, I have therefore concentrated only on those contextual aspects which bear upon the methodical and epistemological heart of the problem. The same intention also explains why I have not considered certain contemporary philosophical views, such as those of Henri Bergson. These developments no doubt have great importance and interest on their own, but as I try to show in the chapter titled, "A Possible Integration", my primary concern is with the transcendental transformation of the meaning and value of intuitive thought brought about by Indian philosophy. Let us begin this chapter in the form of a critical search for the doctrine of intuitive knowledge in the Western world

2.2 Intuitive Knowledge in the West

A very misleading and superficial view assumes intuitive knowledge to be merely of antiquarian interest in the realm of Romanticism and has no systematic relevance for our present modern day (Tarnas, 1991, p. 375). However, the conventional opinion on this matter is inaccurate and misleading on both historical and systematic grounds. In the historical aspect, the untenability of the role of intuition is far from being clear and settled in the form that the West has actually held. It was the realization of its complexity that motivated me to study the contextual aspect of the problem formed in the Indian and Western worldview. When I began to undertake such a study, I was coming to the realization that the doctrine of intuition is in fact the foundational question of epistemology. For in intention, if not in actual formulation, the question at issue here is

the non-empirical conditions of the possibility of experience and knowledge. I believe this is the basic issue which the doctrine has attempted to tackle, hence I consider the debate over the concept of intuition to be one of those ultimate and crucial debates which shape and structure the development of not merely epistemological reflection, but of philosophy itself. There is an underlining systematic continuity which persists in spite of cultural differences. I call this continuity, a continuity of function, for in both contexts, the basic philosophical question involved is the condition(s) of the possibility of experience and knowledge. Though this invariant question has received different contextual formulations, nevertheless, it has a thread of continuity in all the debates. Accordingly, I believe that both from the systematic and cultural points of view, a discussion of intuition is likely to be a rich source of fresh and suggestive illumination.

2.3 The Basis of Knowledge

The word "epistemology" is derived from the Greek root "epitome" meaning knowledge and "logos" meaning study, indicating a study of knowledge[4]. It is an account of a mental activity, which operates necessarily in relation to what is known. The peculiar characteristic of knowledge is such that it in not an entity in itself in the way "reality" is an entity in itself. It involves quite a few factors when analyzed carefully can lead to a different comprehension of knowledge altogether. The problem of defining the nature and source of knowledge exist in almost all societies. Sometimes people misconceive "knowledge" in areas in which a mind cannot have knowledge but can have only belief, an opinion or an intuitive hunch. It will be worthwhile to distinguish

[4] (www.wordinfo.info/words/index.php?v=info&a=view_results&s=epistemology[4])

schematically several questions pertaining to knowledge by an analysis of the concept, so that the main focus of the ensuing discussion may be clearly indicated.

With any knowledge, the object has the possibility of not being true while the subject's claims it to be true. The term "know" is generally used to show that we have a special sort of competence. For example, when one says that "I know how to drive" or "I know the multiplication table", they are implying that they know how to do something. The other sense of "know" is used to show that we are acquainted with whatever is claimed to be known. For example, the term "know" is used when one states that "I know the professor of education". In this case, the use of "know" is used in the sense of "knowing that". However, it should be noted that the two senses of "know" that is being distinguished is not exhaustive as "the term "know" may be used in more than one of these senses in a single utterance"(Lehrer, 1978, p. 2). The third sense in which we use the term "know" is to show that we have the necessary information. For example, when one says that, "I know that the earth revolves round the sun", or "I know that the earth attracts everything towards its center". It should, however, be noted that the "information sense" of the term "know" is often implicated in the other senses of the word" (Ibid, pp. 2-3). As a result, the information sense of know "is fundamental for human cognition and required for theoretical speculation and practical investigation" (Ibid, p. 3).

Irrespective of the sense in which the term knowledge is used, in order to qualify as knowledge, a claim has to satisfy the following conditions; (1) truth condition (2) certainty condition (3) justification condition. A claim would qualify to be a "knowledge claim" if and only if whatever is claimed to be known is true, it can be true either in the absolute sense as in "it is true that the snow is white" is true. The former may

be called absolute conception of truth "because there is no reference to a language, or to any part of language, and thus this conception of truth is not in any way relative to a language, or to any part of language, and thus this conception of truth is not in any way relative to a language or the meaning of any of the terms in a language" (Ibid, p. 11). The latter is called semantic conception of truth "because the truth of a sentence depends not only upon the facts but upon what the sentence means, upon the semantics of the sentence" (Ibid, p. 11). Whether the sentence "snow is white is true depends not only upon the snow and its colour but upon the meaning of the sentence and the words contained therein" (Ibid, p. 11).

One cannot claim to know "unless one is completely sure of it" (Ayer, 1956, p. 16). Being sure is what distinguishes knowledge from belief. One can continue to believe in something about which he is not completely certain and "admit to what one believes to be true may nevertheless be false but this does not apply to knowledge" (Ibid, p. 16). In the case of knowledge, to "say of oneself that one knew that such and such a statement was true but that one was not altogether sure of it would be self-contradictory" (Ibid, p. 16).

Whatever one claims to know one must be able to justify. Ayer considers it as *the right to be sure condition* (Ibid, p. 16). Whatever one may call this condition, in effect it means that one should be able to give the evidence on which one's claim to knowledge is based. This is especially so when the claim to knowledge is disputed. Something would count as evidence if and only if it is know to be true. The justification condition would also be met if we are able to show that the claim in question is coherent within a system of beliefs. Though Radhakrishnan at no place explicitly stated the conditions of

knowledge, in one of his assertions, namely "certainty...is the truest test of knowledge" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 14) he seems to be covertly agreeing with the necessary and sufficient conditions laid down above for determining a legitimate claim for knowledge. After a brief description of the necessary and sufficient conditions of knowledge, the cognitive situation will depict the following inter-related factors: a subject that knows, an act of knowing, a content of knowledge, object of knowledge and finally language (Bhattacharya, 1987, p. 62). In the presence of these, knowledge takes place.

2.4 Classical Western Epistemology

Apart from the difficulty of defining knowledge, there is also the source of knowledge. Rationalism and empiricism are generally recognized as the sources of knowledge in modern Western thought, but this has not always been the case. Going back to the Classical period to the time of Homer and other early Greeks, knowledge was considered that which was acquired by "personal experience" (Hussey, 1990, p. 13). Socrates, much like the ancient seers of India, gave no general reasons for disputing human claims to knowledge. Knowledge for him was that which is "justifiable" by a method of cross-examination. Thus, for him, knowledge was "examined true belief" (Woodruff, 1990, p. 65). Socrates considered a sort of knowledge that was always present in a person, but never taught. When considering questions as to how this knowledge was to be acquired, he argued learning is actually the recollection of lessons learned before birth. The theory of recollection is a process of gaining knowledge in this life by recollecting what the soul knew prior to the present life. Thus, it is a theory which advocates the knowledge is *a priori* in the sense that its source is independent of experience. The nature of this theory is made clear in the course of the dialogue between

Socrates and the slave boy in *Meno*. An ignorant slave is chosen for the purpose who had no previous knowledge of geometry but recognized the difference between indubitable true and false propositions brought to his notice for the first time. This recognition, without the previous knowledge of geometry, implies that the truth was a possession of the soul incarnated in human form. It also implies that the truth is still in the soul, otherwise there would be no possibility of eliciting this in this life. Thus, Plato's claim is that all knowledge is *a priori*. The main point is that the theory of recollection does imply some conception of transcendent reality. Socrates in fact assumes that the soul would have been in a state of knowledge for all time, even before birth. The slave in the *Meno* possessed the knowledge because he had already learnt it. Thus, "the theory of *Anamnesis* logically involves belief in transcendent forms" (Ross, 1951, p. 35).

Socrates' theory is clear enough though he, like Radhakrishnan, did not say how he thought so. It, nevertheless, entailed that a person would have true beliefs of what they are not aware of and that after becoming aware of such beliefs and being questioned about them, they may come to know in the full sense the subject of those beliefs. From this, it can be concluded that one may know things that one was never taught.

Plato was another philosopher who also held that true knowledge is innate. He argued that knowledge did not come to the soul at or after birth. "In fact, it is a part of the soul itself, and is always with the soul" (Op. cit., p. 83). This conception had led him to conclude that the soul existed before the body and during the prenatal existence it learned all that with which it is familiar in this world. But, how did this innate knowledge came to the soul in the former state of being? Plato also did not provide an answer to this question.

Plato had spoken of three kinds of knowledge. The first kind of knowledge is that which comes through senses. For him, the knowledge that is derived through the senses is not true, because senses are not always true. The second kind of knowledge is that of opinion regarding things. An opinion about things may be valuable in certain situations, but it cannot be true knowledge, nor is it innate. The third kind of knowledge, which alone is true, is innate and is in the mind. All mathematical truths, general concepts, absolute and abstract ideas fall within this category (Ibid, p. 85). Absolute ideas about beauty, justice, goodness are never acquired though experience. They are innate and in the possession of the mind itself, independent of experience (Ozman, 1990, p. 2). To Plato, there are two kinds of worlds – the world of ideas and the world of the objects of senses. The world of ideas is real and the other is only a shadow or phenomenal. The world of ideas is eternal, spaceless, and unchangeable. It is the world of the mind, a world of abstract thought. Absolute ideas are entities in themselves and form an organic whole, a *World of Ideas*. To Plato ideas are interrelated in a divine order or perfect mind. The world of "ideas" is the mind of God. Ideas are eternal divine thoughts; they are gods (Ibid, p. 3). Platonic idealism regards that true reality is thought, and therefore, is spiritual. Thus to Plato, thought alone is true and perfect and does not belong to the material world.

In contrast to Plato, none of Aristotle's major works had as its central topic the nature of knowledge. He did not seek to argue that knowledge is possible, but assumed its possibility (Taylor, 1990, p. 116). There are two constituents of human life which makes it supremely worth living - excellence of character and intellectual excellence (Ibid, p. 117). In Aristotle's terminology, what is known (or knowable) is what can be taught

and learned. The necessary truths can be learned in precisely two ways-either by deduction or by induction. In either case, one learns by making use of something which is already known. According to Aristotle, "All teaching is from things previously known" (Ibid, 119).

2.5 Modern Western Epistemology

In the history of modern Western thought though, some philosophers cut loose from the apron strings of traditional idealism. They only believed in empirical-data and sensory experiences that could lead to acquisition of valid knowledge. Descartes was one who proposed the wholesale rejection of the legacy of supposed knowledge from the past and start from the beginning in order to build an adequate knowledge of the world (Tarnas, 1991, p. 276). The best thing to do was to doubt everything, with the exception of one belief that we cannot be mistaken about, and that is that we are thinking. Even to doubt this is to affirm it. Thus, Descartes concluded *cogito ergo sum,* (I think, therefore I am) (Landesman, 1997, p. 50). John Locke was another to deviate from the traditional doctrine of innate knowledge, whose standpoint is known as empiricism. Very roughly speaking, empiricism takes the view that knowledge is a matter of a certain complex kind of experience. For Locke, there was no such thing as innate ideas. At birth the mind is like a blank sheet of paper, a *tabula rasa*, (blank slate) upon which ideas are imprinted. In other words, all ideas are derived from experience by way of sensation and reflection. Locke did not overly concern himself with the nature of mind itself but concentrated on how ideas or knowledge are gained by the mind (Gallagher, 1982, p. 75). Whereas the rationalists lead by Descartes, were so called since they assumed that mere experience,

however complex, does not amount to knowledge, that knowledge crucially involves the use of reason.

Now, the question arises what is it about that makes it a case of knowledge, rather than of mere belief? The rationalist's claims that it involves insight and understanding, and – as a rule - some kind of inference or proof, in sort some achievement of reason. The empiricists deny this. For them to know something is just to have observed it and to remember it in the appropriate way, to have the right kind of experience of it. Some empiricists maintain that the kind of experience, which constitutes knowledge, can be completely accountable for without reference to reason. They defend the view that we can account for our technical beliefs and even for our technical knowledge solely in terms of the senses and memory. Empiricist maintain that, "We observe things; we remember what we observe; what we remember guides us in what we do, what we pay attention to, what we observe and thus memory, rather than reason, is supposed to produce the kind of complex experience which constitutes technical knowledge" (Frede, 1990, p.226).

Rationalism as represented by Descartes focused on certain essential aspects of knowledge. Knowledge is *a priori* and is to be identified with the necessary connections of ideas. It would be a mistake to consider Descartes' reality through sense experience as it is totally independent of experience since sense experience acquaints us only with the world that changes and appears and cannot represent the total world of reality. The metaphysical theories known as *a priori* are supposed to reflect reality in its essential characteristics in the way not represented in everyday sense experience but in the way the world must be to intellectual insight. The role of *a priori* in conceiving a concept such as a square is put to serious question by empiricist thinkers who believe that the *a priori*

cannot determine any law or principle that manifests itself in science and not everyday experience. "Of course, the individual as being in possession of this concept owes something to sense awareness; perhaps if they had never seen objects with approximately square surfaces, they would never would have been able to learn what a square is" (Landesman, 1997, p. 163). Nevertheless, the domain of rationalism is primarily limited to that of logic and mathematics. Since Descartes' philosophy was rationally conceived, he depended naturally on innate ideas and their logical connections to know the nature of reality as a whole. His was a highly intellectual conception where logical connections could only be known rationally.

Keeping in mind further connected philosophical assumptions for the time being here, let us investigate Rene Descartes and John Locke and the doctrine of intuitive thought. I concentrate on Descartes and Lock in this context because I consider them pioneers of rationalism and empiricism respectively.

2.6 Descartes and the Doctrine of Intuition

The most subtle expositions of the concept of innate knowledge and its role in modern-day epistemology in the West can be said to begin with Descartes. It is essential to study the Cartesian position because Descartes was the first who successfully and very methodically represented his views pertaining to the dominant role of intuition in epistemology. To achieve this, Descartes worked out a program, which will be discussed considering his earlier and later works. While undertaking to explain his theory, the central concern would be to explore his philosophy of mind as expounded in his later writings, which were already entrenched in the treatise called the *Regulae*, because it is natural that one's methodology should proceed in collaboration with one's rules. If we

embrace another one of Descartes' major later work, *the Mediations,* which contributed to his program, then it would be rational to conclude that they were implicit in the rules, though not fully, but at least roughly. Let us, hence, study the status of the *Regulae* in the interpretation of the philosophy of Descartes.

Let us begin with the implications of his third and fourth rules mentioned in the *Regulae ad Directionem Ingenii* (*Regulae*). In them, he gave a preliminary account of intuition and deduction and claimed that only through these two, can indubitable knowledge be achieved (MacDonald, 2000, p.98). In the *Regulae*, Descartes did not initially talk of the doctrine of intuition and of representative perception. Rather he adopted an empirical realist's view which held that objects are directly apprehended by the mind. That apprehension takes place in an immediate face to face manner. Subsequently, Descartes became aware of the incompleteness of his account of the sources of knowledge in the *Regulae* making him accept an *aliquid amplius* to account for a doctrine of intuition (Smith, 1952, p. 53). Another epistemological assumption for a proper and better understanding of Descartes is when he adopts the phrase, "clear and distinct", which consistently occurs throughout his writings; though only once in the *Regulae*, but over 30 times in the *Meditations* (Ibid, p. 55). In this application of his clear and distinct perception, he aims to explain the immediate experience of "face-to-face" manner so that the apprehension would be clear "even to rustics" (Ibid, p. 59). This capacity for immediate "face-to-face" awareness cannot be fallacious, and for this reason he speaks elsewhere of the "natural light of reason" (Ibid, p. 60).

The problem of the meaning of "clear and distinct perception" is really the central issue in the interpretation of the *Discours de la Methode* (*Method),* which played a major

role at the heart of Descartes' philosophy. If the *Principia Philosophiae* (*Principles*) is taken into account, we find,

> In our early years our mind is so immersed in the body that it knows nothing distinctly, though it apprehends much sufficiently clearly...forming many judgments and contracting many prejudices from which the majority of us can hardly eve hope to become free. I term that *clear* which is present and manifest to an attentive mind just as we are said to see objects clearly when, being present to the intuiting eye, they operate upon it sufficiently, strongly and manifestly. But the distinct is that which is so precise and different from all other objects that it contains with itself only what appears manifestly to him who considers it as he ought....when for instance, an intense pain is felt, our awareness of it is very clear, but is not always distinct; for men usually confound it with their obscure judgments as to its nature, assuming as they do, that in the part affected their exists something similar to the sensation of pain of which alone they are clearly aware. Thus cognition can be clear without being distinct; but can never be distinct without being also clear. (Haldane, Vol. I, 1955, p. 237)

This distinction as well as the analysis regarding "*clear and distinct*" perception of the *Discours* is in agreement with and dealt more elaborately in the *Regulae*. "The most complete exposition of the clear and distinct ideas is to be found in the *Regulae de inquirenda veritate*, though it is included in the theory of *Method*. In both works, the dominating theme is the quest for certainty and universal knowledge" (Gibson, 1932, p. 151).

To substantiate the above point further, Rule IX of the *Regulae* should be taken into consideration, which states, "We ought to give the whole of our attention to the most insignificant and most easily mastered facts, and remain a long time in contemplation of them until we are accustomed to behold the truth *clearly* and *distinctly*" (Vol. I, 1955, p. 28). The phrase *clearly and distinctly*, which occurs in the *Regulae* also occurs sufficiently in his later works such as the *Meditations*.

In the *Regulae*, two important ways of acquiring knowledge are intuition and deduction. Intuition, which Descartes admitted in the *Regulae,* is equivalent to the clear and distinct perception of the *Meditations* (Doney, 1968, p. 188). While explaining this, Descartes accepted in the *Regulae* that two things are required for intuition. One is that the propositions intuited must be clear and distinct and secondly, it must be grasped in its totality at the same time and not successively (Op. cit, p.8). This presupposes the epistemology which Descartes advocated in his later writings. Descartes states that "intuition, not the fluctuating testimony of the senses, nor the misleading judgment that proceeds from the blundering constructions of imagination, but the conception which an unclouded and attentive mind gives us so readily and distinctly that we are wholly freed from doubt about that which we understand" (Ibid, p.8). In addition to intuition and deduction, Descartes also spoke of *Divine Certainty* which he stated in the *Meditations* in the form of *veracity of God.* To quote the *Regulae* in this connection,

> These two methods are the most certain routes of knowledge, and the mind should admit no others. All the rest should be rejected as suspect of error and dangerous. But this does not prevent from believing matters that have been Divinely revealed as being more certain than our surest knowledge, since belief in these things as faith in obscure matters, is an action not of our intelligence but of our will (Ibid, p.4).

The existence of God, which Descartes advocated in his later writings in order to certify the certainty of clear and distinct perception, is also controversial. The fact remains that knowledge of God cannot be apprehended through direct awareness; no inference and analogy can give us the knowledge of God. To account for the knowledge of God, Descartes adopted that it is only through an innate idea that God can be known (Gallagher, 1982, p. 38). Gradually, he claimed an existence of innumerable intuitive ideas to which he formed a class of which the doctrine of *cogito ergo sum* is an example.

While giving an account of the acquisition of knowledge, the concept "experience" and its use in the *Regulae* should be taken into consideration as it presupposes the epistemology which Descartes demonstrates in his later writings. His use of "experience" in the *Regulae* helps in understanding the terms *intuition* and *deduction.* For example, in his deductive method, he made it very clear that deduction is nothing but *successive intuitions*. The intuition, which Descartes accepted in the *Regulae* is free from any type of mystic interpretation; rather, it is taken as a foundation of all scientific knowledge and has also been referred to as *natural light* (MacDonald, 2000, p. 103). Experience as used in the *Regulae* should be understood in its immediate non-fallacious aspect. Descartes seems to be very careful because he never intended to equate immediate experience with sense experience. He used "experience" in two aspects. First is the common sense everyday awareness of the external world, which he claims sharply as frequently fallacious, but the other is the immediate awareness in the sense of *Lumen Naturale* (natural light), which aims at clear and distinct perception (Haldane, Vol. I, 1955 p.4). Thereafter, Descartes' use of "experience" in the *Regulae* always indicates its immediate non-fallacious aspect which aims at achievement of indubitable knowledge. This analysis of "experience" suggests that Descartes uses it as the foundation of his later epistemology in the *Regulae* itself.

Descartes' epistemology centers on this doctrine of intuition in the *Regulae.* To begin with, Descartes gave due attention to ideas not as objects of direct awareness but in their representative capacity, which provides us additional knowledge of them. While separating judgements from immediate awareness he claims that in judgement there is a presence of *aliquid amplius* and this *aliquid amplius* not only calls for a doctrine of

intuition but also for a doctrine of natural belief (Smith, 1952, p. 215). In a passage in the *Meditations III*, Descartes clearly stated how an *aliquid amplius* distinguished judgment from immediate awareness (Ibid, p.216). There, Descartes claimed that what is known sensuously through pineal patterns is imagination which is fluctuating and what is known rationally through common notions and axioms is understanding, which is constant and universal. The images are apprehended through an immediate face to face awareness but the common notions and axioms are innate notions, through which we can obtain scientific understanding even of appearance (Ibid, p. 216).

In order to give an account of sensuous and rational knowledge, Descartes divides ideas in *Meditation III*, as below:

> I find present to me completely diverse ideas of the sun; the one, in which the sun appears to me as extremely small is, it would seem, derived from the senses, and to be counted as belonging to the class of adventitious ideas, the other, in which the sun is taken to be many times large than the whole Earth, has been arrived at by way of astronomical reasoning, that is to say, elicited for certain notions innate in me, or formed by me in some other manner. (Ibid, p. 218)

This above classification of ideas into adventitious and innate in *Meditations III* has been accepted as provisional as he further writes,

> Some ideas are adventitious such as the idea we commonly have of the sun, other are factitious, in which class we can put the idea which the astronomers construct of the sun by their reasoning, and others are innate, such as the idea of God, mind, body, triangle, and in general all those which represent true immutable, and eternal essences. (Ibid, p. 236)

In this connection, if the *Regulae* is also studied, it seems that Descartes also assumed a classification of ideas, while he was dealing with Rule XII. He said, "It is properly called mind when it either forms new ideas in infancy, or attends to those already formed" (Ibid, p. 39). Leaving this classification aside temporarily, if his notion

of simples of the *Regulae* is to be considered, we see how Descartes reduced everything to "simple notions" because they are wholly free from falsity. The examples of simple notions in the *Regulae* such as figure, extension, motion, etc. clearly resembles the innate ideas of the *Meditations*. Even in the *Regulae,* Descartes further asserted that those "simple notions" are purely intellectual which our understanding apprehends by means of a certain inborn light, and without the aid of any corporeal image (Ibid, p. 41).

If a comparison is made between judgements of mathematics and cogito judgements, we find Descartes, in line with Plato. As Plato claimed in the *Meno* that geometrical assumptions are innately there in the human mind, Descartes argued that since we have never in our lives seen a true triangle, or an accurately drawn circle we can not derive these ideas from sensation. When we see a physical triangle, we are simply reminded of the true and immutable nature of the triangle, we recognize it when we see that (Ibid, p. 227). This ability to recognize an instance of a concept is probably what Descartes means by an innate idea. To quote Descartes, "so indeed, we should not be able to recognize the geometrical triangle by looking at that which is drawn on paper, unless our minds possessed an idea of it derived from some other source" (Ibid, p. 228).

This "some other source" indicates the existence of intuitive faculties in the mind, which is more certain than mathematical and geometrical assumptions. Therefore cogito - judgements in the *Meditations* clearly aims at a possession of intuitive ideas in the human mind which is more certain than mathematical assumptions.

In the *Regulae*, mathematical and geometrical assumptions have been accepted as certain, whereas in the *Meditations* they are subject to doubt. Initially, one may find an inconsistency here but actually, if we investigate this point further, we see that Descartes

is consistent insofar as doubting is concerned because in both works Descartes is dealing with *methodical doubt* not with *experimental doubt* (Keeling, 1968, p. 87). Experimental doubt refers to a certain state of mind or attitude which does not voluntarily originate, while the methodical doubt refers, not to a feeling, but to a decision or volition. Further, the methodical doubt is different from skepticism, while experimental doubt frequently contributes to skeptical frames of mind (Ibid, p. 88). If this analysis is taken into consideration, we don't find any inconsistency so far as the *Regulae* and the *Meditations* are concerned. Both refer to methodical doubt, none inspires experimental doubt.

2.7 Descartes' Philosophy of Mind

So far I have dealt with the earlier and later works of Descartes and their relationship to one another to find out the crucial role played by the doctrine of intuition. This doctrine, which has become central in his epistemology, necessitates a discussion of his *Philosophy of Mind*, otherwise the doctrine would collapse. Because the doctrine of intuition and the nature of mind depend upon each other for their explanation, one would lose its meaning if one considered each in isolation of the other.

Descartes' methodology leading to his epistemology clearly suggests a philosophy, which he has developed consistently with his own speculations. His doctrine of intuitive ideas would be incomplete unless his psychology is also taken into consideration. Therefore, in this section, I shall concentrate on his explanation of the status of sensation with regards to his conception of soul or how his conception of mind is distinct or different from sensation. Subsequently, it will be seen how his mind-body dualism emerges out of the doctrine of intuitive ideas. While explaining the conception of

mind or soul in Descartes, I shall take the following aspects into consideration--intuition, power of reason and will.

Intuition is the primary vehicle of grasping a truth. We "know" as in the "information sense" through the innate capacities of the mind. Intuitive ideas in the mind would mean that our knowledge is determined in accordance with certain principles and concepts which are native in all minds. These cannot be acquired by abstraction from sense experience. While explaining this, Descartes argued that concepts corresponding to the simple natures, such as geometrical objects and equality cannot be derived or acquired but they are *primitive* and *innate* in thinking. In this sense of "innate", all ideas that are ideas of simple natures are intuitive and are referred to as first principles (Haldane, 1955, Vol. III, p. 7). These innate-ideas can be apprehended only by an operation, known as intuition (*intuitus*) which is innate in the sense of not acquired. All clear and distinct ideas derivable from them are innate because they can only be produced through an operation known as deduction, which is also innate. Because intuition and deduction are "mental operations by which we are able, entirely without any fear of illusion, to arrive at the knowledge of things", intuition is purely an intellectual activity which in return is clear and distinct, because it leaves no room for doubt (Ibid, p. 8). By means of this intuition, one attends to the *simple natures* which are *innate*. The outstanding characteristic of those *simple natures* as accepted by Descartes is their perfect clearness and distinctness, but with only intuition human knowledge would seem to be incomplete because it only gives knowledge of first principles. From these first principles, again the mind by means of its *power of reason* deduces further knowledge. To quote Descartes, "the first principles themselves are given by intuition alone, while on

the contrary the remote conclusions are furnished only by deduction"(Ibid, p. 8). While explaining the nature of deduction, Descartes affirms that in the steps of deductive procedure intuition plays a dominant role, because for him deduction is but a *succession of intuitions* (MacDonald, 2000, p. 103).

Finally, everything depends upon free will which is freedom of the human mind. We use this freedom correctly when we affirm only what is quite clear and distinct and refrain from assenting what is not clear. Because we are not compelled to determine in the use of our will, we may suspend judgment otherwise we can give assent. This freedom we exercise, yielding or withholding assent is the single characteristic which we posses that resembles the nature of God. If so, then how does error arise? Descartes' explanation would be that one would be dominated by inclinations of the body because we are imperfect, but as God is a bodiless perfect form then this question never arises. However, in the case of humans when the bodily inclinations predominate, it loses its will by surrendering to desires. But when the will attends to the clear and distinct principles, the human mind achieves perfection similar to the nature of God (Gallagher, 1982, p. 39).

These above aspects of the mind constitute the essential nature of the soul. They do not have anything in common with the body, which presupposes his fundamental problem of mind and body. Having explained the nature and operation of mind, we now have to see that *intuition, power of reason*, and *will* do not have anything to do with the body. Intuition, which is supposed to be the primary criterion of grasping truth, has nothing to do with bodily actions. But by the help of intuition, we comprehend in separate non-sensible natures and ideas. Intuition is the direct action of comprehension by means of which clear and distinct perception takes place. This clear and distinct

perception, which is the criterion of truth, has nothing to do with the bodily movements. In order to explain this point further, we may consider it from two angles.

Firstly, our minds cannot be caused to think primal ideas, which Descartes thought to be intuit by the actions of material bodies. Such causal actions would be nothing other than movements. If a particular movement would cause the mind to think clearly and distinctly about anything at all, it could cause it to think about itself, because the movement being particular the thought would be of a particular. But beliefs and emotions are neither of particulars nor of movements. Hence, material bodies and their changes could not be the cause of our beliefs and emotions (Landesman, 1997, p. 115).

Secondly, to suppose that a particular movement could cause the mind to think of it is also not admissible because modes of matter can cause nothing but other modes of matter. Material bodies and their actions cannot cause thoughts of clear and distinct ideas to occur because physical actions and thoughts are modes of two mutually exclusive attributes. "How can a thought which has a certain content and meaning be the very same thing as a burst of electricity or a chemical change among the neurons of the brain" (Ibid, p. 320). An event or state (mode) of one order cannot cause an event or state in another order. Therefore, no clear and distinct thought is reached from sensible appearances or are caused by changes in material bodies. Rather, those clear and distinct thoughts which are supposed to be innate are only approachable by intuition, which is a faculty of the human mind.

The power of deducing, which is supposed to be the *power of reason*, has nothing to do with bodily changes for Descartes accepted deductions in a very special sense. For him, as mentioned, deduction is nothing but a *succession of intuitions*. In other words, it

is *extended intuition*. Similarly, Descartes took the freedom of will to be animate-notion. Therefore, he states that "finally it is so evident that we are possessed of a free-will that can give or withhold its assent, that this may be counted as one of the first and most ordinary notions that are found innately in us" (Haldane, Vol. I, 1955, p. 234).

Hence, it is seen that intuition, power of reason and will, have nothing to do with either material body. They are supposed to be intuitive capacities of the mind. Those capacities only contribute toward the construction of knowledge, while the bodily actions are instrumental to that. The pertinent point that comes out here is that the doctrine of intuition brings about a dualism in order to demonstrate a rational explanation of Descartes' epistemology.

To substantiate the doctrine of intuition, we find it is not merely a hypothesis or a concept, but the philosophical principle occupying a central place in Descartes' epistemology. His doctrine of intuition does not merely contribute to his epistemology, but has its own bearing even in physics (Copleston, 1962, p. 84). This line of argument amply suggests how Descartes has presented an integrated system starting from his earliest work, the *Regulae,* to the latest works like the *Meditations* which are connected to each other. It seems as if they construct a "whole" where all of his other works becomes parts. He has presented such a neatly woven system, that no part of his philosophy should be studied in isolation from the other. In *Rules leading to the Direction of the Mind,* his methodology, metaphysics, physics, epistemology and moral philosophy, all are so linked with each other that acceptance of one, involves the acceptance of others. He once rightly remarked,

> Thus philosophy as a whole is like a tree whose roots are metaphysical whose trunk is physics, and whose branches, which issue from this trunk, are all the other sciences. (Haldane, Vol. I, 1955, p.211)

Leaving apart the metaphorical elements of the above statement, it shows the underlying profundity of his philosophy as a whole and how they merge and unify and are integrated together. For example, if one wants to move around any philosophical concept from any part of his work, ultimately one would find oneself in the same place, from where one had started. One would commit a blunder by considering his philosophy in part when dealing with the issue of intuitive knowledge. Nevertheless, one may find some deficiencies here and there relating to intuitive ideas (Keeling, 1968, p.182), but these philosophical "deficiencies" are not at all deficiencies, rather they constitute fundamental problems for further study.

Descartes, said to be the founder of modern philosophy, started a systematic endeavour to clear out the long-felt philosophical prejudices up to the Renaissance, and showed how philosophizing can be dealt with very methodically. As a consequence of this, along with his other works, he started a philosophy of mind which was certainly the first to have worked out the directive ideas of psychology on our modern sense of the word (Ibid, 291).

2.8 Locke and the Doctrine of Intuition

Descartes' philosophy in general and the doctrine of intuition in particular will be made clear only after we have made a referral and discussion of John Locke, using his famous work *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* as my sole study. While discussing Locke's epistemology, my main concern would be to take his criticism of intuition into consideration, and discuss how his polemic is controversial by throwing

light on its positive and negative aspects. I contend that Locke's recognition of non-sensory sources of knowledge and its analysis never supports his polemic and subsequently how he failed to supply a corresponding philosophy of mind to his conception of knowledge.

Locke's empiricism or the theory that all knowledge begins with sense experience is a direct attack on the dogmatism of the rationalistic thinkers (Aaron, 1955, p. 90) along with the idealism of intuition. Locke expounded the doctrine of simple ideas of sensation and of reflection which are imprinted on empty blank sheets of the human mind (*tabula rasa).* There is no room for a doctrine of intuition which would influence or direct human beings to various kinds of knowledge of mathematical ideas, logical principles, universal laws of nature and particular perceptions of the world. Intuitive knowledge, if any, would have been derived from various combinations of simple ideas of sensation and reflection (Gallagher, 1982, p. 71). What is peculiar to empiricism is that while it can explain knowledge of particulars with reference to experience, it is impossible for the doctrine to explain the universal characteristics of nature in the same way. Just as it is difficult for the rationalist to come down to particulars from the knowledge of the universals, it is difficult for the empiricists to come up to universals from the immediate knowledge of particulars. Thus, Locke's polemic needs to be studied in order to justify considering its significance.

The first Book of the *Essay* where Locke deals with the polemic begins with,

> It is an established opinion amongst some men, that there are in the understanding certain innate principles; some primary notions, characters, as it were stamped upon the mind of man; which the soul receives in its very first being, and brings into the world with it. (Fraser, 1959, p. 37)

This passage in the very beginning of the chapter raises a very concerted effort toward epistemology as a whole and the doctrine of intuitive-ideas in particular.

In order to establish the empiricist foundations of knowledge, Locke first started arguments against the theory of intuition. Locke understands this theory as being the doctrine that there are "certain innate principles, some primary notions, characters, as it were stamped upon the mind of man, which the soul receives in the very first being, and brings into the world with it" (Aaron, 1955, p. 37). Some of these principles are speculative like religious beliefs or whose examples would be "whatever is, is, and it is impossible for there to be something and not be", (Ibid, p. 37) while others are practical such as moral principles. An important underlying aspect, according to Locke, is the one regarding *universal consent.* Because all men agree about the validity of certain speculative and practical principles, those principles are originally imprinted on people's minds and brought into the world with them "as necessary and real as they do of any of their inherent faculties" (Ibid, 39).

Against the above position, Locke argues that even if it were true that all men agree about certain principles this would not prove that these principles are innate, provided that some other explanations can be given of this universal consent. Secondly, Locke opines that the arguments, which were brought in favour of the theory of intuitive principles, were worthless, because there is no universal consent about the truth of any principle (Ibid, p. 39). Children and idiots have minds, but they have no knowledge of the principle that it is impossible for something to be and not to be. He continued further and asserted that if these principles were really innate, then they must be known. Therefore, he categorically remarked that "No proposition can be said to be in the mind,

which it never yet knew, which it was never yet conscious of" (Ibid, p. 40). In other words, ideas cannot be held mentally in latent or unconscious state. There cannot be impressions made on the mind with an accompanying consciousness of them because a mental impression and consciousness of it are identical. No ideas can said to be "in the mind" of which that mind is not either actually percipient, or through memory capable of becoming percipient. To illustrate this, Locke states that, "a great part of illiterate people and savages pass many years, even of their rational age, without ever thinking on this and the like general propositions" (Ibid, p. 45). He took the same position towards practical, speculative and moral principles (Ibid, pp. 62-64).

In defence of intuitive principles, one may argue that all these possibilities would be true only when people came to use reason. Furthermore, these principles are knowledge, which are only implicit as a capacity for knowledge. The capacity itself is innate. To this, one may respond that there are those who apprehend no general abstract principles at all. Locke did not deny that there are principles of this kind, but he refused to admit that there is any sufficient reason for calling them innate, though he spoke of intuitive-notions, which is equivalent to intuitive ideas (Ibid, pp. 38-39). It may be that throughout the polemic, Locke was attacking only intuitive principles, but not intuitive ideas (Ibid, p. 62-64). He assumes that the mind has inherent faculties, which it brings into the world since he wrote, "I think nobody who reads my book can doubt that I spoke only of innate ideas and not innate-powers" (Gibson, 1968, p. 38). In other words, the mind has no innate-ideas, but it has innate facilities (Sorely, 1965, p. 144). Thus, the mind which is endowed with reason has a capacity to intuit the connections of ideas and as a result, derive the knowledge of necessary truths. Even with regards to mathematical

propositions, he does not prefer to call them intuitive propositions, rather he considered that out of a misuse of language, only confusion and misunderstanding could result (Holland, 1980, p. 14). In order to justify this position, he categorically stated that intuitive principles are not "a distinct sort of truth" (Op. cit., p. 39), which can be considered a direct attack on intuition. Considering the true spirit inherent in the threads of his argument, one would be driven to a dilemma between intuitive principles and intuitive ideas, however, what is key to his central position is that sense perception is the thrust of knowledge, not intuition.

The positive element of the polemic certainly brings out a clearer understanding of the role of experience, which was not explicit in Descartes' epistemology. In other words, an incomplete explanation by Descartes is supplied by Locke who gives more consideration to the role of experience. While in Descartes, experience is needed as the occasion on which the mind brings forth from itself materials that it previously contained only virtually, it was not produced by experience (Landesman, 1997, p. 52). In Locke, however, that very experience constitutes the essence of knowledge. The fundamental and philosophical distinction between them was only concerning the question of method rather than of substance. Descartes assumed the very existence of experience without delving deeper while Locke questioned the very fundamental role of experience. Of course, one cannot blame someone for accepting the views of another. Both differ in their attitude regarding their approach to epistemology as a whole. Descartes was above all a system builder who insisted that the foundation of well-grounded certainty is only to be reached by the attempt to render doubt universal. Having obtained his indubitable starting point, he was discovering the true method by means of which a connected system

of knowledge might emerge to lead us towards certainty, where the role of experience was justifiably insignificant (Tarnas, 1991, p. 277). On the other hand, in case of Locke, he was not attempting to furnish any new method of knowledge. Rather his aim was "not to teach men a new way of certainty, but to endeavor to show wherein the old and only way of certainty exists" (Gibson, 1968, p. 209). Further, regarding his role, he asserted that "it is ambition enough to be employed as an underlabourer in clearing the ground a little and removing some of the rubbish that lies in the way of knowledge"(Ibid, p. 209). Instead of seeking a method which enables us to proceed dogmatically, he proclaimed the need for criticism. Therefore, instead of simply accepting experience, he questioned the very fundamental role of experience, which in return becomes a virtue of his own epistemology. Thus, one should not claim that the empiricism of Locke is an alternative to the rationalism of Descartes, rather it supplied material to make rationalism more effective.

The negative element of the polemic constitutes Locke's recognition of non-sensory sources of knowledge such as intuition and demonstration. His acceptance of three degrees of knowledge (*Intuition, Demonstration and Sensation*) in Book IV of the Essay deserves consideration.

For Locke knowledge is "the perception of the connection of and agreement, or disagreement and repugnancy of any of our ideas" (Fraser, 1959, p.167). He claimed further that sometimes the mind perceives the agreement or disagreement of two ideas immediately, without intervention of any other; that is called intuitive knowledge (Ibid, p. 176). For example, that white is not black, that a circle is not a triangle, that three is more than two and equal to one and two. This kind of knowledge is "the clearest and most

certain that human frailty is capable of. This part of knowledge is irresistible, and like bright sunshine, forces itself immediately to be perceived, as soon as ever the mind turns its view that way" (Ibid, p. 177). The next degree of knowledge, which Locke calls *Demonstration*, is where the mind proceeds to discover the agreement or disagreement of ideas by the intervention of other ideas, called demonstrative knowledge. Each step of demonstration must have intuitive evidence, or in other words demonstration is nothing but a series of intuitions. These two kinds of knowledge, intuitive and demonstrative, are the only kinds of knowledge properly termed. There is another third degree of knowledge, sensitive knowledge, which "passes under the name of the knowledge" (Ibid, p. 185) but its account is not very detailed or careful.

Locke's acceptance of intuition as the ground of certainty very much resembles the intuitionism of Descartes. "His (Locke's) account of intuition and demonstration is exactly the same as Descartes and shows clear evidence of the influence of the Regulae" (Woozley, 1975, p. 46). Descartes was already explicitly dealt with in *Regulae* where he distinguished intuition (*intutius),* in the third rule as "not the fluctuating testimony of the senses, nor the misleading judgement that proceeds from the blundering constructions of imagination, but the pure intellectual organizing of which an unclouded attentive mind is capable; a cognizing so ready and so distinct that we are wholly freed from doubt about that which we thus intellectually apprehend" (Haldane, Vol. I 1955, p. 8). To sum up, intuitive knowledge of the mind is fully aware, unclouded, wholly attentive and entirely free from doubt. In the *Regulae,* Descartes emphasized the minds full activity in intuitive knowledge. Using this intuitionism as a spectacle of Descartes, one can look at Locke's *Essay*, particularly Book IV, and find similarities. For example, Locke states that,

"Certainty depends so wholly on this intuition, that in the next degree of knowledge which I call demonstrative, this intuition is necessary in all the connections of the intermediate ideas, without which we cannot attain knowledge and certainty" (Fraser, 1959, p. 178). He further asserted, "Now, in every step reason makes in demonstrative knowledge, there is intuitive knowledge of that agreement or disagreement it seeks with the next intermediate idea which it uses as proof…By which it is plain, that every step in reasoning that produces knowledge, has intuitive certainty"(Ibid, pp. 180-181). Locke again adds, "These two via, intuition and demonstration, are the degrees of our knowledge; whatever comes short of one of these, with what assurance so ever embraced, is but faith or opinion, but not knowledge, at least in all good truths" (Ibid, p. 185).

From the above passages of Book IV of the *Essay*, it is clearly seen how Locke's conception of knowledge is Cartesian in its essence. According to Locke, this knowledge is either intuitive, a direct perception of logical relations of the "2 plus 1 equals 3 type" or the demonstrative, defined by Descartes as a chain of successive intuitions. "Again, the *deduction* of the *Regulae* is indistinguishable from the *demonstration* of the Essay, each being conceived as consisting of a connected chain of intuitions" (Gibson, 1968, p. 212).

If the above analysis of non-sensible sources of knowledge by Locke were true, then it seems that Locke reached a crisis in his epistemological speculations. On the one hand, he propounded a rationalistic idea of knowledge he found in Descartes, and on the other was his doctrine of experience. To avoid this crisis, Locke maintained that we can have knowledge of general truths by no other means except intuition and demonstration which resulted in acquisition of particular truths by an appeal to our senses. As a consequence of this, he accepted the third degree of knowledge referred to as *sensitive*

knowledge. However, acceptance of another degree of knowledge created confusion. When Locke stated that, "Intuition and demonstration, are the degrees our knowledge; whatever comes short of one of these, with what assurance so far embraced, is but faith and opinion, but not knowledge, at least in all general truths" (Fraser, 1959, p. 185) he clearly shows the absence of an appeal to sense perception. He may have been subsequently aware of this inconsistency and as a result admitted the third degree of knowledge. Nevertheless, it leaves an impression that he may have become aware of the inadequacy of perception in the construction of knowledge. "It must be admitted that Locke's account of it (sensitive knowledge) is not very detailed or careful, perhaps because he thought it to be his business as a philosopher to give his attention primarily to knowledge proper" (Morris, 1931, p. 48). Aaron also writes, "The manner in which he introduces this third kind of knowledge reveals his uncertainty as to its precise nature". He continues further that "Locke attempts to give further details of sensitive knowledge both in IV, ii 14 and in IV, xi he speaks in the most uncertain tones" (Aaron, 1955, p. 245). The above consideration suggests that for Locke only intuitive and demonstrative degrees of knowledge constitute the criteria for the construction of knowledge. In other words, for Locke intuition is a credible and recognized form of knowledge, something which he borrowed directly from Descartes (Lamprecht, 1955, p. 308). The aforementioned certainly reveals an inconsistency in Locke's polemic and demonstrates that his teaching is identical with Descartes. So far as the object of intuition is concerned Locke is not in total opposition to Descartes. For Descartes, the object of intuition is pure and non-sensuous while for Locke it is sensuous. As far as intuition is concerned, it starts with immediate apprehension and in that immediacy whether the object of apprehension

would be non-sensuous or sensuous, seems unwarranted. Considering one can speak of them as distinct, but to infer both as separate seems fallacious. Therefore, Aaron correctly argues that for Locke intuitionism is part of his empiricism. "Locke, it seems to me, owes his intuitionism to Descartes and in his description of intuition in IV, ii, 1 of the Essay, he brings out this feature of Descartes' teaching very clearly" (Op. cit., pp. 31-32).

Having gone into some details to the intuitionism of both Descartes and Locke, we find that Locke was at the very least indirectly or directly influenced by Descartes. However, Locke did not merely receive, rather he rendered a more definite and modified doctrine and developed it into a new direction. In doing so, Locke failed to make use of intuition in the Cartesian fashion as he put this theory of intuition in the context of his contention that knowledge goes only as far as experience is concerned (Op. cit., p. 308). As a consequence of this, Locke could not use reason to leap beyond ideas in the mind to things outside of the mind.

2.9 Locke's Philosophy of Mind

The above discussion of intuition in both Descartes and Locke amply suggests that Cartesian intuition is likely to be stronger than that of Locke. Any further understanding of Locke's view of intuitive knowledge can only come after a critical examination of his epistemology and his philosophy of mind. It requires a corresponding conception of knowledge, but it seems Locke does not provide such an account. Locke started with the presumption that since people are born with no knowledge innate in them, the mind at birth must be a kind of *tabula rasa*, ready to receive impression, but not yet having received any. Therefore, all knowledge and beliefs which have been acquired by individuals must be founded in the experience of individuals during their lives and not

from any other source. Since the mind does not possess intuitive-ideas, Locke asserted, due to sensation and reflection the mind receives ideas. Reflections, which are not sensible ideas, however, depend upon activities of comparison and abstraction, so that in the reception of them the mind cannot rightly be regarded as merely receiving sensation (Fraser, 1959, pp. 121-122).

Once again, Locke claimed that what we think about must be provided by some means other than thinking. Since he did not admit intuitive principles, from which thinking may start, he adopted that it is provided by simple ideas of sensation. Further his contention was that the mind must be provided with ideas before it can think, since ideas do not come from thinking, therefore they necessarily come in to the mind through the senses. If ideas come to the mind through the senses prior to thought, then we must be able to detect their passage into the mind (Landesman, 1997, p. 120). This is what Locke was trying to do throughout with much confusion. The reason for this confusion might be due to lack of psychological clarity. Having been convinced that the ideas with which thoughts arise in the mind are through sense-perception, he should have supplied a careful analysis of sense-perception in order to distinguish that of which we are immediately aware from that which we conclude from our immediate awareness. "It is an obvious vulgarization of Locke's opinion to suppose that he held knowledge to consist in the *having* of ideas: they were rather the conditions of knowledge, or to speak more precisely there were two conditioning factors – the supply of ideas and the mind's ability to perceive agreements and disagreements among them" (Holland, 1980, p. 12).

In emphasizing the role of experience in regard to the construction of knowledge, Locke offered an important contribution. On the other hand, his challenge becomes futile

without any proper analysis. Lock's psychological method was not itself sufficient to achieve his critical aim (Morris, 1931, p. 25). The fact remains that Locke's doctrine of experience and Descartes adherence to the doctrine of intuitive ideas very well supplies a solid background for creating a new theory. Therefore, we see that the mind instead of being merely a *tabula rasa* of Locke, ready and waiting to receive impressions was also gifted as part of its nature with certain capacities similar to those advanced by Descartes.

However, Locke and Descartes differ fundamentally as to the assumption "that thought is the essence of the mind and extension is the essence of the body of material substance" (Gibson, 1968, p. 217). Locke claimed on the ontological level that to comprehend that nature of substance is too much for our understanding (Ibid, p. 222). He was right in arguing that we cannot think of qualities independently, there must be something in which they inhere. Further, we do not think of an object as merely being the sum of its qualities. There must be something, which holds qualities and marks the object an object, without this the qualities fall apart and cannot be unified. That something cannot be apprehended by sense, because that is not a quality. From this it follows that according to the principles of empirical philosophy it cannot be apprehended at all. Therefore, Locke claimed a substance to be, "something he knew not what" (Ibid, p.309). Moreover, his polemic against the idea that the soul always thinks is considered to be a fallacy of *ingoratio elenchi* (Anscombe, 1975, p. 189).

To sum up, the views of Locke presented in Book I of the *Essay* regarding rejection of intuitive principles and the views of Book IV regarding acceptance of non-empirical sources of knowledge like intuition, put Locke in between empiricism and rationalism. Therefore, his outright rejection of intuitive principles and ideas in Book I

seem to be philosophically flawed. His deliberations in Book IV of the *Essay* seem quite significant because whenever possible he followed Descartes to the maximum. Therefore, one can rightly remark that Locke's construction of general knowledge is like Descartes' in nature, once the materials are available. From the above illustrations, the natural analysis of knowledge undertaken by Locke becomes clear. Locke's account of experience was not final. Locke only aimed at empirical derivations of ideas and their origins overlooking the vital aspect, that is to say cooperation of the senses with an understanding that aims at justification (Yolton, 1961, p. IX).

If the above observations regarding Locke's attack on intuitive principles and his corresponding philosophy of mind are to be accepted, the traditionally accepted relation between Locke and Descartes in particular and empiricism and rationalism in general has to be modified. Works of both Locke's *Essay* and Descartes *Regulae* are specific routes of intellectual development because these two thinkers are seeking to approach the source of knowledge from different angles. Locke's achievements remain more of a continuation of Descartes as he also proposed to survey the field of human knowledge as had been done, but from an entirely different point of view. In addition, from *Problematic Idealism* it is learnt that Descartes' epistemology overlooked the significance of sensation from the construction of knowledge, rather he deduced judgements concerning reality from concepts alone without relying on sensation (Aaron, 1971, p. 31). On the other hand, from the *Physiology of Human Understanding,* the question of right or justification regarding the employment of concepts are primarily over the question of fact and this justification in the case of epistemology can only be achieved through the deduction of categories from a pure understanding (Ibid, p.32).

Unfortunately due to the confusion amongst historians, empiricism, and rationalism have been accepted as two blocks having diametrically opposed views, which they are not. If a comparison is to be drawn here between empiricism and rationalism, taking the above views into consideration, the common pre-suppositions of both empiricism and rationalism was that a method was required and these two schools differed, if in nothing else, the nature of that method. They differed about how certainty was to be attained and in their conception of how ideas are formulated and derived from the use of our senses, as opposed to the use of reason. It should be added, however, that these differences are differences of tendency only (Hamlyn, 1961, pp. 55-59). In a sense, to talk of opposing schools of philosophy is misleading because there is much in Descartes that would by certain criteria make him an empiricist, and there is similarly much in Locke that would make him rationalist. However, they exhibit tendencies in opposite direction. Rationalism tends to appeal to reason as the source of knowledge and of some ideas at least, while empiricists tended to depreciate reason as a source of knowledge and insist that all ideas come from experience. The rationalist view of the mind tends to be that of substance engaging in cognitive activity, while the empiricists tend to take a passive view of the mind and eschew the notion of substances. The issue between empiricists and rationalism over the genesis of our ideas can be said to be misplaced. If it is strictly a question about the genesis of those ideas then it belongs to the realm of psychology. If it is a question about the logical character of those ideas then it seems to be too complex to be dealt with by a simple-minded espousal of rationalism or empiricism (Ibid, p. 60). To come full circle, it is first necessary to remember that we are

talking here of the origin of experience and of what is in it. The task would never be able to be developed but from a critique of knowledge.

2.10 Foundation of a Transcendental Theory

An analysis of intuitive thought in Western epistemology would not be complete without a discussion of Immanuel Kant and his contributions, considered a major advance in epistemology and landmark in the history of philosophy. If one wants to study the actual epistemological assumptions of Kant then going through the *Critique of Pure Reason* is a must as his theory of knowledge is a very significant part of his philosophy as well as for the issue before us. In this critique, Kant attempts among other things, to establish the validity of knowledge. The class of synthetic *a prioiri* propositions, whose logical nature, function and systematic connection with each other and with other types of propositions are the main topic of his philosophy

So far as Kant is concerned, he does not accept the dichotomy of empirical and analytic propositions because he believes that we are in possession of propositions which do not fall into the above categories. Kant's classification is more accurately not of propositions but of judgments (i.e. regarding propositions asserted by somebody). Every judgment according to Kant is either analytic or synthetic.

> In all judgments in which the relation of a subject to a predicate is thought…this relation is possible in two different ways. Either the predicate B belongs to the subject A, as something which is contained in this concept A; or B lies outside of concept A, although it does indeed stand in connection with it. In the one case, I entitle the judgment analytic, in the other synthetic. (Smith, p. 10, 2nd Edition, 1961)

Kant asserts that a judgment is either *a priori* or *a posteriori*. A judgment is *a priori*, "if it is independent of all experience and even of all impressions of the senses," (Ibid, p.2).

Judgments, which are not *a priori,* are *a posteriori*, i.e. they depend logically on other judgments, which describe experiences or impressions of the senses.

After stating this, the basic question is: How are synthetic *a priori* judgments possible? Kant formulated and answered this basic question in the *Transcendental Aesthetic* and the *Transcendental Analytic*. This problem of synthetic *a priori* judgments depends on Kant's general view of judging or thinking. One of his fundamental assumptions is that judging and perceiving are irreducibly different. Kant expressed this sharp distinction between judging and perceiving as one between two distinct faculties of mind, i.e., understanding, and sense. "By means of sense, objects are given to us and sense alone provides us with perception; by means of understanding, objects are thought and from it there it arises concepts" (Ibid, p. 33). The understanding is the faculty of recognition through concepts, which refer to sense given particulars and are either *a posteriori* or *a priori*. To Kant, the general notions, which are neither abstracted from perceptions nor applicable to it, are ideas. The faculty of employing ideas is called reason, which covers both understanding and pure forms of perception. Both editions of the *Critique of Pure Reason* contain a refutation of the problematic idealism of Descartes, who held that there is only one empirical assertion that is indubitably certain, namely, that "I am".

In order to refute the above form of idealism, Kant employed the thesis that the empirically determined consciousness of my own existence proves the existence of objects in space outside me, which means, I am conscious of my own existence as determined in time (Ibid, p. 276). But all determination in time presupposes the existence of something permanent in perception and this something permanent cannot be intuitable

in the empirical self. For it is the condition of my existence of something real outside me. Consciousness in time is thus necessarily connected with the existence of external things not merely with the representation of things external to me. In other words, one becomes conscious of oneself in perceiving external things. The question of inferring the existence of external things does not arise.

The problem of the external world, which emerges here needs further clarification. Kant said, "It always remains doubtful whether the cause be internal or external, whether, that is to say, all the so called outer perceptions are not a mere play of our inner sense, or whether they stand in relation to actual external objects as their cause," (Ibid, 1st Edition, p.368). This is the classical formulation of the problem of the external world. Kant's aim is to show that it as a pseudo-problem, because this arises from false metaphysical assumptions. Kant refers to this assumption as transcendental realism, which he opposes with his transcendental idealism. The defining characteristic of transcendental realism is its confusion of appearance with things-in-themselves. Proponents of this transcendental realism such as Descartes regarded, "Time and space as something given themselves, independently of our sensibility" (Ibid, p. 369). As a consequence of this erroneous conception of space and time they treat objects in space and time as things-in themselves. This view of space and time gives rise to a conception of reality or nature as composed of bodies containing only primary and secondary qualities.

Because of the assumptions that physical objects exist independently of the mind, the transcendental realist, "finds that, judged from this point of view, all our sensuous representations are inadequate to establish their reality" (Ibid, p. 369). This leads to an

empirical idealism that what is accessible to consciousness is only its own private and subjective modifications, i.e. the Cartesian ideas and sensations. It is no doubt with this in mind that Kant concluded, "If we treat outer objects as things in themselves, it is quite impossible to understand how we could arrive at a knowledge of their reality outside us, since we had to rely merely on the representation which is in us" (Ibid, p. 378).

Kant offered his own doctrine of transcendental idealism, which he claimed to have established in the *Transcendental Aesthetic*. It is defined as "the doctrine that appearances are to be regarded as being, one and all, representation only, not things- in-themselves" (Ibid, p. 369). This account of Kant's distinction between empirical and transcendental enables us to estimate Kant's account of perception and also to resolve the problem that arises from the notion of appearance. The epistemological assumptions deduced from the above refutation of problematic idealism, which leads to the distinction of inner and outer appearance and things-in-themselves is clearly connected with the contrast between sense and understanding. In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, therefore, it is remarked that, "The division of objects into phenomena and noumena and the world into a world of senses and a world of understanding, is therefore quite inadmissible in the positive sense, although the distinction of concepts as sensible or intellectual is certainly legitimate" (Ibid, 2nd Edition, p. 11). It is also held further in the contrast between the two faculties, that this is not a logical but transcendental distinction (Ibid, p. 62). For Kant, it was merely logical to deny the contrast, that is to deny the dogmatic view that understanding gives us knowledge of intelligible objects. Kant admitted the existence of an intelligible contribution to knowledge but on the other hand denies that this provides knowledge of any intelligible objects. The knowledge of intelligible objects can only be

obtained by the co-operation of both sense and understanding. Therefore, from the refutation of Descartes' problematic idealism, Kant arrived at a new account of the conception of mind. In the case of Descartes, the mind was only aware of inner and subjective states by means of its own understanding without recognizing the outer, that is to say external objects. But Kant's analysis presupposes the mind is not only aware of outer objects directly but makes awareness of inner sensation possible. Therefore to Kant the mind needs both sensibility and understanding and their nature is such that in isolation of one the other is useless.

2.11 A Possible Integration

For the sake of convenience, I have divided my discussion on Western notions of knowledge and the value we assign them into negative and positive aspects. In the negative part, I have provided, along with Kant, criticism with particular reference to Descartes and Locke. Having criticized their epistemology, my concern is now to deduce epistemological assumptions from this criticism. The positive aspect would be a discussion of its relevant implications to Indian epistemological. Subsequently, I will attempt to synergize the domain of rational and empirical discourse as Kant had done, but with Eastern and Western epistemology in order to provide a "new" integrated theory of intuition.

There is a connection between the metaphysical conceptions of Indian epistemology and those developed by science and the Cartesian - Lockean theory of ideas, i.e. the theory that ideas or sensation are the immediate objects of consciousness. Rationalists define the nature of intuition in such a way that it remains totally inaccessible to consciousness, thus they unable to justify its role or validity of its conception of

knowledge. It is the misguided rationalism which gives rise to equally misguided assumptions that intuition is metaphysical quackery. In opposition to this view and to skepticism, an integrated theory of intuition can empirically demonstrate that the issue in question is not mystical in the sense in which some rationalists believe. One can therefore maintain that this intuitive experience of knowledge can be as immediate and veridical as the experience of one's own subjective state. This is possible because intuition is a form of human sensibility rather than as a thing-in-itself so that it is not external in the transcendental sense.

The task is to break the framework with due regard to both rationalism and empiricism. Having this as a background we must operate with the Ramsey's Maxim, which means that the truth lies not in one of the two but in some third possibility which can be discovered rejecting something assumed as obvious by both the disputants, in order to resolve the controversy (Penelhum, 1969, p. 17). The similarities of this problem are echoed in the form of the Copernican Revolution. The predecessors of Copernicus had difficulty in explaining the apparent motions of the planets on the supposition that they all revolve around the earth. It was similarly impossible in philosophy to explain how there would be *a priori* knowledge of things on the assumption that knowledge is a passive conformity to the objects.

Similarly, if phenomenal characteristics are explained in terms of the behaviour of the knowing mind, it is impossible to see how knowledge can be *a priori*. For to be an object of knowledge, they must conform to the structure and activity of the knowing mind, which makes knowledge possible. To explain in other words, if one assumes that the human mind is the center of the phenomenal universe, then things must conform to

our mind, rather than our mind to things. This sort of explanation certainly gives leverage to the rationalistic method because while empiricism has to stop at the limits of sense-experience, rationalism is perhaps even more fruitful beyond those boundaries. The rationalistic method accomplishes this and more as it can not only prove a thesis which transcends possible experience, but with equal force it can prove its antithesis.

As the mind is the only factor which is always present in experience, it is legislative for all objects which appear to the senses to be known in judgments, which means that to make *a priori* knowledge possible, objects must conform to the transcendental requirements of the mind. If this position is accepted, a meta-theory flows. This awakening is a necessity for a new method as it is not possible to prove philosophical issues by empirical and logical methods. This is why I posit a "new" method, an integrated theory of Indian idealism and Western realism.

This conception of the meta-theory germinated in the notion of integration in the philosophy of Sri Aurobindo (Sharma, 1979, pp. 383-385). As the Copernican Revolution aimed at rectifying the ambiguity of the existing pattern of thinking, the notion of an integrated system similarly aims at clarifying one's manner of knowing. Its purpose has been not only to extend one's ideas of knowledge further but also to correct what is already known and to supply a touchstone of values or lack of values of concepts of knowledge. Thus, it would be opining up a world of ideas by undertaking a most ambitious task. Such a task is therefore a preparation for a new complete system of knowledge which was also Radhakrishnan's primary concern in *An Idealist View of Life.*

Putting this thorough a meta-theoretical structure, the controversy of rationalism verses empiricism is paved over by further investigation. To explain this in detail,

rationalists assume there are *a priori* principles and they give the knowledge of things of themselves, while empiricists assume that the only knowledge is sensible knowledge and that there is no place for *a priori* principles. To begin with, the latter view that within sensible knowledge there is no place of *a priori* principles should be rejected; the former view that there are a prior principles should be accepted, but also that knowledge is necessarily sensible knowledge. This conclusion cannot be shown by rationalists with their speculative metaphysical method, or by empiricist with their physiology of mind. Thus, a new meaning of "experience" must be established which has certain non-empirical conditions of this possibility. What are those non-empirical conditions of this possibility and how to know them? The answer would be they are *a priori* interpreted as Radhakrishnan would: they are intuitive in a Brahmanian sense. To put it otherwise, the very means of the term, "intuition" needs to be changed. One should no longer go back to the old meaning of intuition in order to grasp its meaning. When the meaning is changed, all other corresponding concepts such as "experience" are changed. Naturally, all connecting issues relating to epistemology as a whole get themselves transformed. As prefaced earlier with Indian epistemology, to study the meta-physical reality we have to adopt a new method. The richness of Indian thought can be conveyed to a Western audience by making use of Western concepts. Such an attempt certainly does not devalue the richness of Indian thought. But when this method of investigation is adopted, all the crucial concepts connected with "knowledge" change as does the concept of "intuition".

PART THREE – A NEW THEORY OF INTUITIVE KNOWLEDGE

3.1 Revisiting Philosophical Underpinnings

In review of the doctrine of innate-ideas of Descartes, Locke and Radhakrishnan, there is no clarity and much confusion as they have individually mixed up both the sense of transcendental and empirical knowledge by demarcating its boundaries. As evidence, Descartes' acceptance of the doctrine was somehow in the virtual sense but Locke convoluted it by developing his polemic considering only the empirical aspect. Sources of the confusion may probably be due to Descartes' own formulation of the doctrine. Radhakrishnan's theory on the other hand sees the doctrine in its transcendental sense aiming at the justification of assigning values to non-empirical conditions of experience, but without analytic structure. Thus, a new theory is needed that would organize or synthesize our experience. Its mode is intuition. So intuition is a description of a certain mode of integration rather than the product. The integration referred to is not empirical or psychological but a meta-physical synthesis.

Whether or not our intuition is a valid source of knowledge has been a factual and not a meta-physical question. A meta-theory, however, is concerned with what is meant by saying that something is intuited. To put otherwise, philosophers have always tried to determine if knowledge is intuitive, and if all or some ideas of the genesis of our idea are innate. They have not tired to answer what is meant by intuition itself. The classical Western formulation refers to a first order question while the meta-theory refers to a

second order question as pointed out by the Analytical philosophers. Analytic philosophers, particularly Quine (1960) stated that questions of first–order refer to objects while question of second order refer to words. He writes,

> Yet we do recognize a shift from talk of objects to talk of words...It is the shift from talk of miles to talk of mile! It is what leads from the material mode into the formal mode, to invoke an old terminology of Carnaps's. It is the shift from talking in certain terms to talking about them. It is precisely the shift that divests philosophical questions of deceptive guise and sets them forth in their true color. (pp. 271-72)

Without gong into too much of detail regarding the views of Analytical philosophers and their linguistic pre-suppositions, we can see that second order questions really are concerned with concepts. This conceptual analysis has nothing to do with objects. This sort of question refers not to things but to our mode of knowing things. Similarly if the ideas of theory and meta-theory are to be fitted into a model, we can say theoretical statements are questions of the first order, while a meta-theory refers to questions of the second order because it is about the theory itself. To use an Indian perspective, a meta-theory deals with questions about speculative possibilities rather than a critical one (Herman, 1976, p. 2).

The model of first-order and second order questions along with the distinction of theory and meta-theory should be used in a discussion concerning the Western exposition of the doctrine of intuitive ideas. So far the issue has been discussed at the substantive level and not in a methodological perspective; the doctrine of intuitive ideas discussed so far has been on a substantive level which refers to questions of first-order. When Plato expounded the doctrine of innate ideas in its ontological aspect, and empiricists in their psychological tenet, it was simply treating the doctrine on a substantive level. These philosophers were grouping around the factual aspect of the doctrine which refer to

questions of first-order. Their analysis's didn't address the methodical and epistemic aspect of the doctrine. They dealt with questions of actuality but not with the question of possibility. This is the primary confusion, thus, the doctrine must be disengaged from its substantive level and discussed in purely a methodological perspective. However, no factual questions regarding ideas being intuitive are raised. Instead, starting with a logical question, the doctrine will be transformed into a method along with how this method is to be achieved. Since it is not a question of fact, it cannot be established on the basis of old methods. Therefore, a proper method is suggested for the interpretation of the possibility of human knowledge which is free from the dogmatic assumptions of rationalism and skeptical illusions of empiricism. Hence, the doctrine of intuition which is considered a theory will be articulated in the form of a meta-theory which aims at the possibility of theoretical cognition.

Now the obvious question is how to develop this meta-theory in order to achieve its intended purpose. To answer this question is to demonstrate its argument. For a philosophical thesis cannot be proved either from common sense or by an appeal to experience. It also cannot be proved by logical demonstrations. Hence, the method of proving a philosophical proposition must be meta-physical. In this chapter, taking the theoretical implications of the Copernicus Revolution into account, the form of a meta-theory of intuition and its implications of epistemology will be suggested. Firstly, what is involved in a meta-theory of intuition will be concentrated on and how the Copernicus Revolution has radically changed its claims and methods. Critics may challenge the very validity of the argument to synthesize a meta-theory of intuition from Western realism

and Indian idealism by way of integration, but must accept the premise of its framework, the possibility of this knowledge, is itself analytic.

The structure of the Cartesian-Lock arguments has already been explained as to how the major premise of their arguments, interpretations, and failure to give intuition its due was developed. A sketch of Radhakrishnan's doctrine of intuition has also been rendered to provide what was lacking. Unfortunately, that sketch has to be analytically filled in order to give it a dressing palatable for the West to consume. In the West, three possible lines of further development of the intuitive doctrine can be seen. They add flesh to the meta-physical scheme of the Radhakrishnan's perspective of a theory of intuition, which we have seen lacked a scientific temperament. *Phenomenology, Genetic-epistemology* and *Analytic Philosophy* all begin their investigation of a definite explanation for this possible condition of human experience at this point of departure.

Although these three intellectual traditions of *Phenomenology, Genetic-epistemology* and *Analytic Philosophy* have their own specific concerns which were developed in a complex manner in attempts to solve specific issues, they all have a certain affinity with the meta-physical philosophy of Radhakrishnan. For our purposes, they may be looked upon as both continuing certain lines of investigation suggested by Radhakrishnan and at the same time strengthening and enriching the Indian position by means of their more rigorous methods of development. It is not hereby suggested that these schools would not successfully challenge many assumptions and doctrines of Indian thought but what is more important to note is the continuance of certain Radhakrishnan themes. As a kind of general analogy, we many think of these three different kinds of investigation as concerned with three aspects of the structure of a meta-physical

argument. Of course this is to be taken only as a kind of analogy since what is intended is to bring out the affinity between Radhakrishnan and these three styles of thought.

In the reconstruction of the meta-physical argument, I suggest that the first premise is some kind of structural description of our experience. For example, such statements as that our experience necessarily has a sensuous aspect and that our sensibility is of the spatio-temporal kind and so on. These descriptions represent the basic structures of our experience. If all such descriptions could be taken together in their systematic interconnection, then we would have a total picture of the forms of experience as a whole. Such a description would not be concerned with empirical contingent details about the content of our experience than it would be of a description of the essential structures of our experience. Cognition of these structures is not mere empirical cognition nor is it merely a deduction from arbitrary assumed definitions. A cognition of the form of our experience is concerned with essential structure and such cognition has a remarkable similarity with what the Phenomenologist call as "eidetic-intuition" (Moran, 2000, p. 134). A thorough and rigorous attempt to describe these essential structures would hence presuppose the method of phenomenological description. I do not of course carry out such a description with methodological rigor but in principle this part of transcendental philosophy seems to call for the method of phenomenological investigation. In a similar manner, the phenomenological attempt may be located within the overall structure of a meta-theory investigation.

The second premise of my argument is concerned with the necessary conditions of the possibility of experience. A similar general and fundamental condition of possibility with Radhakrishnan is of course the means by which its active synthesis with

the Spirit grounds the possibility of experience. The concept of pure understanding is, as it were, continued in this synthetic act. From this point of view, the meta-theory synthesis stands for the general cognitive capacity of the mind. This cognitive capacity is not merely an empirical fact or datum for it is this which lies behind all empirical facts and cognitions. This capacity is therefore in some sense as *a priori* capacity of the mind which makes experience and awareness of experience possible. In other words, in this part of the investigation I want to lay the foundation for a cognitive structural psychology which would account for the basic constitution of cognition as a result of an active part of the subject. Such a cognitive psychology has been fully worked out in the theoretical and empirical investigations of Piaget (Richmond, 1971, p. 31). Hence, this aspect of my position may be taken as finding its fulfillment in the genetic-epistemology of Jean Piaget.

Thirdly, the entire transcendental investigation emphasizes the crucial fact that philosophical claims can be validated not by empirical or merely logical methods: philosophical propositions being synthetic *a priori* claims require a unique mode of investigation which could settle their validity. Such a mode of investigations I call meta-theoretical with the work of the Analytical philosophers making a useful contribution here, for they have been mostly concerned with problems of philosophical methods. Starting from Mortiz Schlicks's ideas about the turning points in philosophy to J.L. Austin and P.F. Strawson, there is a very long and rich debate on philosophical methodology. Although the terminology used by the Analytic philosophers is very different from that of Radhakrishnan and although they would be highly critical of Radhakrishnan's doctrine, yet there seems to be a fundamental similarity between their

method of conceptual analysis and method of the meta-theory. This similarity is seen in different ways in each one of the Analytical philosophers I shall be referring to, namely Schlick, Wittgenstein, Austin, and Strawson. From this point of view, therefore, we may think of the whole movement of Analytic philosophy in the West as a stream which feeds a river. The Analytical developments actually enrich, strengthen and help us navigate the Indian waterway. If we look at these three perspectives, we actually can have a much clearer and more profound grasp of the issue with which we are concerned.

3.2 Phenomenology Aspect

In discussing phenomenology, Edmund Husserl will be the primary representative of the phenomenological movement, as he is considered its central figure. In discussing Husserl, my main concern will be his *Transcendental Phenomenology* and how that further serves the requirements of the meta-theoretical investigation. The phenomenological movement and particularly *Transcendental Phenomenology* can be considered a natural continuation of Radhakrishnan's views for the following reasons. It provides the means of carrying out such an investigation and by providing a technique, it also clarifies the nature of philosophical thinking itself. Both were present in Radhakrishnan but were implicit. As Husserl conceives of criticism as one of the disciplines of philosophy, phenomenological philosophy is most accurately conceived as criticism (Moran, 2000, p. 187). Similarly, Radhakrishnan' *Idealistic View of Life* was conceived as an attempt to transform philosophical enquiry into transcendental enquiry by propounding to establish the conditions for the very possibility of an ideal experience. The attempt to achieve an alternative method in philosophical enquiry seems very much conspicuous in both and certainty Husserl's phenomenology shares its methodological

perspective with Radhakrishnan. In *An Idealistic View of Life*, Radhakrishnan emphasizes the fundamental place of inner time, the synthetic character of the understanding of the necessity of the ego, the importance for knowledge of sensory perception and other notions, all which seem part of the phenomenological investigation. Even Husserl's anti-empirical leanings seem unquestionable similar to Radhakrishnan's attitude towards rational or logical speculations (Husserl, 2001, p. 142).

This "new method" proposes that objects must conform to our concepts and the conformation would be sought with the determination of by what right and under what conditions these concepts are legitimately applied to objects. This turn to consciousness with its specific methodological content gives the basic sense to the notion of "meta-physical". This methodical move which my thesis deals with is not whether there is *a priori* knowledge, but how such knowledge is at all possible. The consequence of this enquiry into the conditions of possibilities of experience and of the knowledge of phenomena yields the concrete picture of consciousness as understanding and reason. This attempt of dissecting the faculty of understanding itself, which has been conceived as the proper task of transcendental philosophy, sets out upon a fundamentally phenomenological explication. By means of a meta-physical turn, the essence of consciousness is discovered, both as understanding and as reason. The inherent claims of consciousness must be explicated making it the focus of enquiry that attempts to isolate the essentials of human experience and knowledge and to display their inter-relationship. Similarly Husserl characterized his own enterprise as a "method by which I want to establish, against mysticism and irrationalism a kind of super-rationalism which transcends the old rationalism as inadequate and yet vindicate its inmost objective"

(Spiegelberg, 1971, p. 84). In all these respects, his method coincides with phenomenological "criticism".

As one is impelled to establish the meta-theory in order to justify necessary propositions, Husserl similarly conceived of his transcendental phenomenology as the only justification of necessary truth. To exhibit the point in more detail, phenomenology has unfortunately been critically referred to as a "methodological solipsism stripping everything from our intuitions" (Moran, 2000, p. 189). But Husserl's philosophy is sound and rational in that he believes there are *a prior* principles or "truths", however, he does not agree with traditional rationalists that there is a faculty of special power of reason that would identify these truths (Ibid, p. 129). Rather, these *a priori* truths are to be located and defended in term of a special type of seeing and in this sense Husserl is a sort of empiricist (Ibid, p. 95). But his empiricism is not the traditional empiricism of Locke since he maintains what Locke would never allow, that is, there are necessary truths which can be established though intuition. The fundamental doctrine of Husserl's phenomenology can be summarized in the term, "categorical intuition" (Op. cit., p. 120). With rationalism, he maintains that we can and do have knowledge which is neither empirical nor trivial; with empiricism, he maintains that all knowledge comes from intuition. However, contrary to the traditional empirical movement he insists that intuition itself gives us the necessary truth (Moran, 2000, p. 127). And as Radhakrishnan made an elegant list of the fundamental *a priori* principles basic to the very nature of human consciousness, similarly Husserl's phenomenology is the investigation of the nature of human consciousness with a view towards disclosing certain special intuitions that yield necessary truths. These special intuitions are called "*eideti*c" or "essential" and

are to be distinguished from the traditional notion of "experience" which is limited to what Husserl calls factual or empirical intuition. His interest in empirical intuition is not an interest in the empirical contents of these intuitions but rather in their essential forms. Hence, it would be very natural to conclude that both Radhakrishnan and Husserl are similar, particular in their search for *a priori* foundations of all experience and knowledge. The "intuition" which seems to be the decisive factor in the foundation of the necessary truth for Husserl appears to be similar to Radhakrishnan's notion of intuition. If both Radhakrishnan and Husserl are to be compared, intuition plays such a fundamental role. At one level, what Husserl seems to be doing is to extend the scope of intuition in any essential structure. On the other level, there is a difference regarding "intuition" between Radhakrishnan and Husserl. Radhakrishnan speaks of synthesis proper because he wishes to emphasize the activity involved in thought, whereas Husserl's intuition seems to emphasize the receptivity (Ibid, p. 61). The emphasis on receptivity brings empiricism nearer to Husserl than Radhakrishnan.

However, in spite of the above difference, the function of the notion "intuition" for both seems to be basically the same. Husserlian intuition is not something sensuous like that of empiricists (Husserl, 2001, p.42), so far one can say that Husserl's intuition pre-supposes some activity, which Radhakrishnan may term "synthetic insight" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 173) but they are identical. Radhakrishnan's synthesis may be regarded as the basis upon which the phenomenological "intuition" can take place. Thus, it can be said that in Radhakrishnan's notions of synthesis and Husserl's thesis on intuition there is only the difference of terminology, but functionally they address the same problem.

Thus, in investigating the nature of human consciousness, phenomenology studies the essential structure of an act and contents of consciousness, a study based not on mere empirical generalization but on the intuitive grasp of the essence of phenomena. Husserl undertook to examine his philosophy and to reformulate it in terms of a new critique of reason, for which phenomenology provided the foundation. For him his own critique was even more radical that Radhakrishnan's because it not only made metaphysics but all philosophy a more rigorous science.

Since the publication of the *Ideen* of phenomenology, the science of the essential structure of "pure consciousness" goes along the name of transcendental phenomenology. The title "transcendental" that Husserl developed can be considered a metaphysical investigation because it executed a transcendental turn in modern philosophy. In view of all the above points, Husserlian transcendental phenomenology is considered a natural offspring of an investigation of the possible condition of human experience (Moran, 2000, p. 145).

3.3 Phenomenological Reduction

Phenomenological reduction or *epoche* (literally abstention) was considered by Husserl to be his greatest discovery because it brings us to a crucial point in his *Pure* or *Transcendental Phenomenology* and at the same time in the history of the phenomenological movement. The purpose of reduction is to guarantee the purity of the description and to enable in the discovery of the essence that is essential to Husserl's analysis of necessary truth. The reduction assures us that the object described by phenomenology would be the phenomenon, or only the intentional object of experience. Thereby, the reduction compels us to look at why we simply see, without the presumption

of any interpretation imposed upon it. Consequently, phenomenological reduction does not deny any scientific facts; it only suspends them so that the investigation can be undertaken only with what we see (Ibid, p. 11).

Reduction guarantees the purity of the description by forbidding us to describe the "natural world". To put it otherwise, reduction of *epoche* enables us to describe consciousness and its contents rather than the world and its objects. Phenomenological reduction also guarantees the seeing of essences and not just individuals. The purpose of this reduction is to reduce descriptions to descriptions of essences; the aim is to focus attention on the meaning of phenomena rather than on the various peculiarities of a particular experience (Bell, 1990, p. 167).

Finally, the reduction is intended to eliminate from philosophical investigation a number of puzzles, particularly regarding the problem of existence. Phenomenological reduction never questions whether something exists or not and is real or not. Because it describes only the essence, existence is irrelevant. It is not that the phenomenologist is not interested in the analysis of what it is for a material object to be but the central function of reduction, according to Husserl, is to "bracket" it for the purpose of phenomenology to abstain from asking irrelevant questions (Op. cit., p. 78).

In the *Ideen*, the implication seems to be that what is transcendental about phenomenology is that it suspends all transcendent claims, that is assertions about reality other than that of consciousness (Spiegelberg, 1971, p. 126). The fullest discussion of the term occurs in Husserl's last publication *The Crisis of the European Science and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Here he wants to assign it a wider meaning in line with the Cartesian approach, according to which a transcendental philosophy "reaches back",

(i.e. literally, "ask back for") to the ultimate source of all knowledge" (Ibid, p. 126) with the implication that this source is to be found in the ego. The phenomenological reduction makes its appearance when Husserl enters upon the "fundamental meditation" of phenomenology, which is to yield pure phenomena, and which cannot be attained in the "naïve" or "natural" attitude. It is at this point that Husserl turns to Descartes, but at the same time, he makes it clear that his own reduction is not to be interpreted as a Cartesian doubt, which denies, experimentally or temporally in the existence of the things reduced (Chakravarty, 1998, p. 94). Even the term *epoche* does not mean a form of universal doubt but it only demands, what it is for one to believe in their own existence. To put it otherwise, the primary function of all reduction, for Husserl, is to make us aware of what is indubitably given.

Husserl distinguishes two stages of this phenomenological reduction; *psychological reduction* is the reduction to the essence, and is a step on the way to the purified phenomena, while the function of *phenomenological reduction* is to free the phenomena from all trans-phenomenal elements, from all beliefs in trans-phenomenal existence and leave us with what is indubitably or absolutely given (Op. cit., p. 147).

To find out how the element of the Indian conception of intuition may fit here, we can turn to how Radhakrishnan might have conceived of this transcendentalism and its presence in Husserls' phenomenology. Since transcendental knowledge is occupied not so much with objects as with the mode of our knowledge of these objects, this mode of knowledge in so far is possibly being *a priori*. The specific claim of Radhakrishnan is to attend to our experiencing of the objects, rather than to the objects directly: "knowing a thing and being it are different" (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 138) which clearly resembles

the Husserlian thesis of *epoche.* The transcendental investigation of Husserl calls for suspension of belief of existence and non-existence in order to achieve this transcendental cognition and *epoches* is instrumental to that.

Husserl describes *epoche* in negative terms as the suspension of existential beliefs but in this writing he describes modes of awareness as not a psychological, empirical or a mental state, but as *a priori* awareness, which is evident for transcendental investigation. The essence of phenomenology corresponds to this awareness of objects. Furthermore, in order to experience the awareness a certain special intuition is necessary, which is not possible by empirical experience, but by a transcendental experience. As phenomenology is the study of the essential structures of the consciousness comprising its ego, subject, acts, and contents, it is not limited to psychological phenomena, rather it is carried out with complete suspension of existential belief. Hence the subject of such an investigation would never be an empiricist self but a transcendental self. The experience of such a transcendental self would be an absolute experience, absolute in the sense that no further question behind it is possible. Therefore, this reduction is not merely a moving away from the natural world, but a moving towards something and that is none other than transcendental subjectivity.

3.4 Genetic-Epistemology

If an integrated meta-theory is to be developed as an analytic explanation of Radhakrishnan's intuition, then a necessary and compatible psychological component would be Jean Piaget's developmental psychology because both thinkers started their investigation of the possibility of human experience, albeit their own interpretative models: Radhakrishnan's Brahman to Piaget's scheme. As neither rationalism nor

empiricism can explain the possibility of human experience, similarly for Piaget neither structure without genesis (counterpart of rationalism) nor genesis without structure (counterpart of empiricism) can give an explanation of the possibility of human experience (Furth, 1969, p.179). Therefore, the developmental psychology of Piaget would be of much value while explaining the transcendental structure.

The synthesis of human experience which has already been introduced from the Radhakrishnan perspective can be cleared up after a description of Piagetian schematic operations, which attempts an explanation of human thinking. The notion of schema occupies a very prominent place because the very concept of experience presupposes the operation of schemas. They play the role of active synthesis and thereby make human experience possible. Hence, Piaget unlike Locke, did not accept a *tabula rasa* theory of the mind (Piaget, 1973, p. XI). Rather for him, intellectual operations play an important role in the formation of concepts, although they are tied up with behavioral activities. Thus, the concern would be to explain the operations of Piagets's notion of schema with other corollary functions and to see how he has explained the structural conditions of human experience (Flavel, 1963, p. 215).

An important feature of Piaget's system is the study of structures of developing intelligence, which is opposed to its *function* and *content.* Content refers to raw and uninterrupted behavior data while functions refers to those characteristics of intelligent activity, which hold true for all ages and which virtually define the very essence of intelligent behavior (Ibid, p. 222). According to Piaget, intelligent activity is always an active, organized process of *assimilating* the new to the old and of *accommodating* the old to the new (Piaget, 1972, p.82). Intellectual content would vary from age to age in

the ontogenetic level, while the *functional properties* of the *adaptational* process remain the same. Besides function and content, Piaget assumes the *existence of cognitive structures*. The structures, like content and unlike function, undergo change with age. They are organizational properties of intelligence and are mediators between the *invariant-functions* on the one hand and *variegated behavioral* contents on the other hand and these developmental changes constitute the major objects of study for Piaget (Op. cit., p. 266).

Piaget, in considerable detail described intellectual function in order to give an explanation of human experience. For him, while we inherit the mode of intellectual functioning, we do not inherit the cognitive structures as such; they come into being only in the course of development. He further held that what we do inherit is a *modus operandi*, a specific manner in which we establish relationships with our environment. The mode of functioning generates cognitive structures in the course of intellectual functioning and constitutes our biological heritage, which remains essentially constant throughout our life. It is because of this constancy of functioning in the face of changing structure, its fundamental properties are referred to *as functional invariants.* This constitutes the core of intellectual functioning, which in Piaget's words would be the "*ipse intellectus*" (Piaget, 1973, p.16). Those defying attributes which are said to be invariant over the whole developmental span are principally known as *organization* and *adaptation*. Adaptation comprises two other related but conceptually distinct sub-properties, called *assimilation*, and *accommodation*. Adaptation means adaptation to the environment and occurs whenever a given organism's environment inter-changes. It has the effect of modifying the organism in such a way that further interchanges favorable to

its preservation are enhanced. This adaptation admits the two above conceptually distinguishable components. Although *assimilation* and *accommodation* are distinguished conceptually, they are indissocialble in the adaptional act. Adaptation through its twin components expresses the dynamic outer aspect of biological functioning. Piaget explained that intellectual function in its dynamic aspect is characterized by the invariant process of *assimilation* and *accommodation*. An act of intelligence in which *assimilation* and *accommodation* are in balance or in equilibrium constitutes intellectual adaptation. Both adaptation and organization are closely linked, since adaptation pre-supposes and underlies coherence on the one hand, and organizations are created through adaptations on the other hand (Op. cit., p. 60).

This explanation of intellectual functioning becomes clearer when taking Piaget's notion of schemes and schemas into consideration. The idea occupies a prominent place in his account of cognitive development, especially during infancy. A *scheme* is a cognitive structure, which has reference to a class of similar action sequences, these sequences of necessity being strongly bounded constituent behavior that has been internalized in the absence of a role model. *Schemas* are labeled by the behavior sequences to which they refer and support (Op. cit., p. 102). Thus, while discussing sensory-motor development, Piaget speaks of the schema of sucking, the schema of sight and so on. Similarly in the middle of childhood a schema of *intuitive-qualitative correspondence* develops by which one knows whether or not two sets of elements are numerically equivalent. Adolescents also possess a number of operational schemas. It would be inaccurate though to say that schemas are only named by their referenced actions as they do have more of a role to play. While schemas come in all shapes and

sizes, they all possess one general characteristic which is that the constituent's behavior is sequenced in an organized unity. It's from the functional invariant angle that the schema is to be studied. It is seen that a schema being a cognitive structure is a fluid form to which actions and object are assimilated during cognitive functioning. Schemas, once again, being structures are both created and modified by intellectual functioning. At this point, a disparity between Radhakrishnan and Piaget's conception of schemas is noted. For Radhakrishnan, there is no indication that the constitution of *a priori* forms undergo change whereas the schemas of Piaget do change (Pulanski, 1972, p. 185). Nevertheless, the methodology of both remains the same, i.e., the concept of experience pre-supposes the functioning of certain elements, which are not derivable from sense-content. These are nothing but non-empirical conditions of human experience.

If the operations of schemas are to be studied in its dynamic aspect, it would be known how, because of schemas, mental assimilation is possible. According to Piaget, one of the most important characteristic of an assimilatory schema is its tendency towards repeated application. Only behavior patterns which recur again and again in the course of cognitive functioning are conceptualized in term of schemas. Piaget refers to this repetition as *reproduction and functional assimilation.* Once schemas are constituted, they apply themselves again and again to assimilate aspects of the environment. In the course of this repeated expertise, individual schemas are transformed in several ways; this sort of functioning not only creates structures but changes them continually. First of all, schemas are forever extending their field of application in order to assimilate new and different objects. This is according to Piaget, *generalizing assimilation.* A second important change which schemas undergo is that of *internal differentiation.* Because of

this, recognition of certain objects with an initially undifferentiated schema becomes possible, which he regards as *recognitory assimilation.* And the union of these three basic functional and developmental characteristics of all assimilatory schemas, repetition, generalization and differentiation-recognition, essentially constitute intellectually functioning (Furth, 1969, pp. 44-45). Precisely speaking, the operation of schemas during the cognitive development can be explained as follows. Repetition consolidates and stabilizes the schema besides providing the necessary conditions for change. Generalization enlarges it by extending its domain of application. A differentiation has the consequence of dividing the original schema into several new schemas each with a discriminating focus on reality, but instead of undergoing individual changes of this kind, it also forms inter-relationships with other developments up to a point and then unites to form a single supra-ordinate schema, which Piaget calls reciprocal assimilation, i.e. each schema assimilates the other.

Now it has been stated that assimilation and accommodation constitute the most fundamental ingredients of intellectual function. Both functions are present in every intellectual act of whatever type and developmental level. Thus, their concurrence may be said to be strictly invariant but on the other hand, their relationship is not constant. Rather their relationship changes completely within and between developmental changes (Piaget, 1978, p. 213). Because the functional invariants themselves constitute the core of intelligence in Piaget's system, alternations in the relationship between them must necessarily have important consequences for the kind of intellectual functioning which takes place. Hence, an analysis of relationships is as necessary in Piaget's theory as the invariants themselves.

The fundamental transformation in the assimilation and accommodation relationship becomes conscious during the first two years of life. According to Piaget, assimilation and accommodation are both undifferentiated one from the other. Yet, they are paradoxically antagonistic or opposed to each other in their action during this early period of life because an object and the activity to which the object assimilated constitute for the young infant a single, indivisible experience (Pulanski, 1978. p. 108). Thus, the act of assimilating an object to a schema is hopelessly confused with and undifferentiated from the accommodatory adjustments intrinsic in this act. It is not that infants fail to account for the object, rather they have no way of distinguishing their acts from the events which those acts produced or the objects upon which they bear. In other words, agent and object, ego and outside world are inextricably linked together in every infantile action. The distinction between assimilation of objects to the self and the accommodation of the self to the objects simply does not exist. This condition, the opposition between assimilation and accommodation, stems from this very undifferentiatedness, since infants cannot distinguish their acts from their environmental consequences (Pulanski, 1978, p. 50). Therefore, the necessity to make new and difficult accommodations in order to assimilate novel objects to already established schemas is not possible.

If assimilation and accommodation are undifferentiated and opposed in the radical *ego centrism* of the neonate then how to explain the sensory motor development in their growing articulation and complementation. The network of assimilatory schema is so rich that it encompasses and interprets the reality products, which accommodation presents to it and this richness of schemas provides a guiding framework of meanings, that can explicitly direct accommodatory explorations further into the unknown.

Therefore schemas not only interpret what accommodation presents, they also provide knowledge of what would be next (Ibid, p. 30).

Thus, it is seen that intellectual activity begins with the confusion of experience and of awareness of the self because of chaotic undifferentiation of assimilation and accommodation. Hence, intelligence begins neither with knowledge of the self nor of things as such but with knowledge of their interaction (Ibid, p. 16). Therefore, the constant working of accommodation and assimilation gives rise during sensory motor development to an increasingly elaborate and complex schematic organization. In this way, the transition from undifferentiated antagonism to differentiation and balance or equilibrium is normally established.

Thus, Piaget's theory of intelligence is a synthesis of several epistemological positions. It retains elements of *a priorism*, especially in its emphasis on constructive activity of the subject and in its belief that the object is unknowably independent of this activity, yet it rejects *a prioiristic* staticity and absolutism in favor of developmental cognitive forms. In the same fashion Radhakrishnan selectively includes and excludes views of spiritualism and intellectualism in order to formulate a theoretical framework of the development of his intuition (Ibid, p. 239).

Piaget's microcosmic theory of intelligence, that is the assimilation and accommodation model, can be compared and contrasted with the Indian macrocosmic epistemological acceptance of multiple viewpoints *(anekantavada)* in our quest to develop an integrated theory of intuition. It is the accommodation of new and different beliefs and practices along established patterns of knowledge which is perhaps the most important factor informing the epistemological expressions in Indian thought. Such

accommodation has a long history, stretching back through the centuries to Vedic times. This ability to accommodate the multiplicity and diversity of new beliefs and practices displays a remarkable tolerance for the viewpoint of others. This is not to say that resistance has always been absent from those with opposing views. One can certainly argue that the influence of the British incursions into India with its imperialist baggage as much as the earlier Buddhist philosophy met with marked resentment. Indians, however, have traditionally been tolerant enough to place their views along with other new expressions as those new philosophical views emerged. Despite the subjugation which such accommodation allows there is a very profound underlying unity in believing in the manifestation of all knowledge from one, ultimate *Ground of all being.* The apparent diversity of belief and practice serves to allow an approach to receiving knowledge in whatever way suits the individual's evolution. The recognition of this fact, alongside the notion that the One, *Brahman,* can take a multiplicity of forms, can supply a certain unity to the apparent surface diversity.

From the simplest to metaphysical levels, Indian epistemological thought is characterized by what seems to be opposing viewpoints. The concept is itself one of total non-manifestation which is *nirguna* and yet manifestation in a variety of forms as *saguna.* On the one hand we have a metaphysical concept of a totally transcendent *Brahman* and on the other side a sensuous and rational being (Chennakesavan, 1976, p. 121). Yet Hindus sees no disparity here because all are ultimately one, *Brahman.* Then, again, the cyclonical conception of all existence, both in the microcosm of the individual and macrocosm of the cosmos, means that dual concepts become unified. For what is created must, ultimately, cease to exist in a world of flux and transience, but equally so,

what ceases to exist is reborn again, from the universe to the tiniest flower. Life is death and death is life; all that is born must die and what dies will be reborn. Sometimes quite opposing ideas have been accommodated side by side.

Coming back to our aim of accommodating the role of intuition alongside reason and perception in intellectual development, we find that in both Indian thought and Piaget, all three are considered to be an active agency which makes experience possible. With intuition, reality to the human mind and to ideas is not reduced, nor is it suggested that the human mind creates things. Rather, the assumption is that we cannot know things unless they are subject to certain *a priori* conditions of knowledge on the part of the subject. The claim is that unless this is accepted then we cannot know the Braham-Atman idealism which we innately possess (Coward, 1983, p. 18). Hence, the mind must be thought of as active. This activity does mean the creation of being out of nothing. It means that the mind imposes its own forms of cognition, determined by the structures of human sensibility and understanding. Therefore, the "synthesis" which is talked of here is not of construction but of getting verified by the content. As a result, all cognitive content must be verifiable contents of intuitive experience. According to Radhakrishnan's thinking, both the divining force of idealism and the resistance of realism are equally present (Ibid, p. 20). Similarly in Piaget's theory, intelligence is always considered an active organized process of assimilating the new to the old and of accommodating the old to the new. Like Radhakrishnan, an integrated synthesis occurs in order to explain the possibility of the structural conditions of human experience (Ibid, p. 17).

With Radhakrishnan and Piaget, we find a picture of novel relationship between subject and object. Both admitted that the relationship between subject and object is not a

simple given datum but highly complex. The age old confusing relationship of subject and object is refuted through Radhakrishnan's idealism, when he makes it clear that the subject becomes one with the object. Therefore the knowledge of the object is already pre-supposed in knowledge of the subject. The knowledge of the object constitutes the necessary condition of the knowledge of the subject because the object as given to conscious experience is already subjected to those cognitive forms which the human subject imposes by a natural necessity, for its natural structure as knowing subject. Hence, the cognitive forms determine the possibility of objects. Similarly in Piaget, one should not start with subject but awareness of the self is complementary to the awareness of the object. Therefore, for Piaget knowledge of the self and the knowledge of the object are dual resultants of the successive differentiation and equilibration of the invariant functions which characterizes sensory motor development (Richmond, 1971, p. 80). Radhakrishnan's primary aim is to deal with non-empirical conditions of human experience which is similar to Paigets's main concern. Radhakrishnan argues that experience is not something merely given, it is constituted, and this construction is possible only through non-empirical means. Those non-empirical conditions along with their relative functions constitute the major study of Piaget.

The functional invariants which constitute the essence of intellectual functioning in Piaget are also echoed in the sentiments of Radhakrishnan. Radhakrishnan's position that the purpose of intuition is to connect phenomena so that one can experience them, implies a functional invariant. He claims further this as universal function of intuition, thus mirroring Piaget's theory of functional invariant of intelligence.

Despite these similarities between Piaget and Radhakrishnan, yet a fundamental difference emerges when Piaget admits *structures* as variants (Ibid, p. 64) while for Radhakrishnan structure is invariant. They differ in their account of *structure*, because Piaget takes *structure* at the sensory-motor level while Radhakrishnan takes it further with the meta-cognitive or symbolic level. In addition, with Piaget there is also a continuation of analysis of cognition and biology, whereas for Radhakrishnan it isn't. Piaget's, intellectual functioning is a special form of biological activity: his model of cognitive functioning is an application of the biological order (Ibid, p. 73). While for Radhakrishnan the intellectual functioning is complimented with the spiritual subject. Therefore, the subject of Piaget is an individual cognizing subject unlike the transcendental subject of Radhakrishnan. However, the methodology adapted by both remains the same, i.e. explanation of non-empirical conditions responsible for the possibility of human experience.

3.5 Analytical Philosophy

If Radhakrishnan's theoretical structure is to be accepted as a foundation of the meta-theory suggested, then the obvious question arises regarding its communicable requirements. The transcendental method raises further questions regarding its manner of explanation, medium of expression and the results of such an investigation. The concern here would be to locate its method, medium, and result in terms of Analytic philosophy and to show how some linguistic philosophers have successfully established the same. To this extent, they may be considered as mirroring the Indian tradition. While doing so, Moritz Schlick's development of the method of philosophical investigation will be discussed and shown how Ludwig Wittgenstein developed it further. Furthermore, J.L.

Austin's claim that "ordinary language" should be used as the medium of expression and P. F. Strawson's ideas of a descriptive meta-physics also find a place in this investigative scheme.

Schlick's efforts at establishing a proper method in philosophy with the anarchy of opinions (Ayer, 1956, pp. 53-59), resembles Radhakrishnan, because both visualized the same state of anarchy in philosophy. Earlier, particularly with Descartes, philosophical and mathematical methods were employed together, but Schlick distinguished both and held that the mathematical method can do nothing but harm in a philosophical investigation (Simth, 1952, p. 754). In order to steer philosophy from the path of science, Radhakrishnan claimed that philosophical problems are not factual problems, they are, however, "judgments of values"(Lal, 1978, p. 301). This was the crucial step that he took in order to challenge skeptics and thereby make possible the progress of philosophical pursuit. Hence, he introduced a kind of philosophy whose purpose was to serve as an introduction to values, to warn against fallacies of relying solely on the scientific method, and to set people on the right track (Radhakrishnan, 1980, p. 196). Similarly, Schlick around whom the Vienna Circle centered, embarked upon a vigorous scrutiny of traditional philosophical problems and pointed out the anarchy of philosophical opinion. His primary concern was to be very much critical. The important reason for this, he claimed, was the misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the nature of philosophy from that of science; the philosophic method deals with discovery of meaning while the method of science deals with discovery of truth (Rorty, 1967, p. 53). Pointing out this definite change in philosophical perspective, he further exhibited the question of meaning which he presumed to be the turning point in philosophy.

However, if we bring out the key concept, already introduced, i.e. questions of value and meaning, from the context of both Radhakrishnan and Schlick respectively, we find that philosophy is in search of a method, which is neither empirical or scientific nor logical. For Radhakrishnan, it is a meta-physical method and *An Idealistic View of Life* is the treatise regarding a search of the same method. On the other hand, for Schlick and subsequent members of the Vienna Circle the method of philosophy is conceptual clarification; its sole task is to clarify the meanings of our statements (Ferre, 1998, p. 178). Like Radhakrishnan, Schlick admitted that philosophical problems are questions not of fact, but of what means we attach to that experience, that is our language. Owing to all sorts of grammatical and psychological circumstances, it very easily happens that one falls into a variety of conceptual confusions and thereby into paradoxes and contradictions, torturing ourselves with insoluble riddles. But the philosophical method of meaning-clarification acts as a sort of therapy sharing a similarity to Radhakrishnan for whom the task of philosophy was also therapy. His *An Idealistic View of Life* and its subject matter was an inquiry concerned with resolving that disillusionment which arose out of materialism. Therefore, his inquiry becomes idealistic rather than skeptical. The method of that inquiry was transcendental, nothing empirical, but merely hypothetical, as its subject matter was a method of argument. Hence, for Radhakrishnan the proper task of philosophy consists in the solution of speculative problems such as the purpose of life because such problems transcend rational logic. Thus, philosophy can reasonably attempt to analyze and define the situations. These resemblances, between Radhakrishnan and Schlick, when viewed in this context, show that at the level of method both envisaged a point in philosophy where it does not encompass factual problems as it subject matter,

rather it concerns itself with conceptual or meta-questions. This enables us to conceive of an altogether new activity - conception of philosophy as a means of clarification. This clarification of propositions cannot be science because there cannot be any set of true prepositions about meaning. The reason for this is that in order to arrive at a meaning of a sentence or of a proposition we must go beyond propositions.

Therefore, the pursuit of meaning consequently is nothing but a sort of mental activity. By means of this mental activity, the meaning of propositions are to be sought putting its constituent words in its linguistic structure and this sort of conceptual analysis, in turn, would help in the clarification of words used in a proper context without having a perfectly clear meaning. Therefore, for Schlick, philosophy is to be defined as the activity of finding meaning (Rorty, 1967, p. 50). In a similar fashion, Radhakrishnan also admitted in his time, that the peculiar character of philosophy is an activity of finding meaning. The idea that philosophy is an activity is an essential point of similarity with the activity conception of philosophy (methodology) as incidental. Hence, it exhibits the semblance of the continuity and construct of Indian thought. The essence of the methodological perspective of Schlick's philosophy, in spite of his other theoretical implications, is similar to and definitely intends the same spirit of philosophizing, which was strongly felt later by Wittgenstein.

In Wittgenstein (1994), this conception of philosophy gets more emphasis, when he states,

> Philosophy is not a body of doctrine but an activity. A philosophic work consists essentially of elucidations. Philosophy does not result in "philosophical proposition", but rather in the clarification of proposition". (Tractatus 4. III-4, p.112).

Wittgenstein's background is sometimes elucidated with two remarks from the *Tractatus*—"All philosophy is a critique of language", and "Logic is transcendental" (Ibid, p. 73, 4.0031,6,B*)*. When developed, these two statements suggest that the functions once performed by Radhakrishnan's transcendental logic and diction of intuition are now supplied by Wittgenstein's logical analysis of language forms and by a critique of language or transcendental philosophy of language. This interpretation is useful as a retrospective view of Wittgenstein, which relates his work to the discussion of methodology.

Wittgenstein suggests that a critique of language is the positive remedy for the conditions in which "most of the propositions and questions of philosophers arise from our failure to understand the logic of our language" (Ibid, T.4.003). With Radhakrishnan there is a broadly similar recognition that philosophical disagreements follow a pattern and they can be resolved neither by dogmatism nor by skepticism, but only by transcendental logic.

Similarly, Wittgenstein writes "in philosophy the question, 'what do we actually use this word or this proposition for?' repeatedly leads to valuable insights" (Ibid, T.4.211). Dialectical reason does supply an analogue for Wittgenstein's conception for the active dissolution of linguistic deception, just as there is a hint of philosophical awareness concerned with a sense of reaching limits of human talk and judgment. Especially in his later developments, Wittgenstein approximated to a way of philosophizing. There is a broad analogy between his theme of the bewitching effects of language and Radhakrishnan's description of the human mind's natural inescapable attraction toward transcendental metaphysics and its dialectical illusions (Anscombe,

1975, p. 109). Particularity, if the transcendental argument is to be taken into account, we find a definite resemblance between Radhakrishnan and Wittgenstein. What Wittgenstein means by "grammatical" knowledge (Pitcher, 1966, p. 196), would be considered as equivalent to *apara* knowledge by Radhakrishnan.

Thus, linguistic philosophy could be regarded as an enquiry into the necessary conditions for the possibility of language itself, in a similar fashion that Radhakrishnan tried to discover necessary conditions for the possibility of experience. Hence for the Linguistic Movement, philosophical problems are problems which may be solved or dissolved either by referring to language or by understanding more about the language we use. If we carefully examine the language used by philosophers we would find that it is largely the ambiguities of language and the misuse of language that are possible for some of the difficulties of philosophical questions. In fact a large number of philosophical statements and puzzles, when analyzed can be found to be meaningless. It is thus claimed by the Analytical school, that language alone forms the entire subject matter of philosophy and analysis of language becomes the key to philosophical investigations (Tarnas, 1991, p. 354). As an example, logic, mathematics and traditional metaphysics are said to consist entirely or almost entirely of *a priori* propositions. But these so called propositions are puzzling because truth of such propositions cannot be established by an appeal to sense experience, and then the problem arises of how such a position can have a non-empirical method of validation and what that method is. It can be argued that the method of validation consists in simply understanding the proposition either by examining the proposition alone, or by deducing it from other propositions so understood, or by some kind or argument that makes no reference to empirical matters of fact. It has

been held that *a priori* propositions are necessarily true. How any proposition can be not simply true but necessarily true seems to be deeply puzzling. For a linguistic philosopher, a necessary proposition would be of such a nature that its truth can be ascertained simply by reference to the use of the words or symbols that occur in its expression, without any further appeal to sense-experience. "It is ironic that Descartes, in wondering whether perhaps he alone existed, used language to do the wondering...The first indubitable, therefore, is not that I exist, but that dialog exists. My doubt itself is framed by dialog, for it is framed by language which is a product of language" (Gallagher, 1982, p. 58). Linguistic theory asserts that sentences that seem to express *a priori* propositions really express only linguistic rules or rules of inference. That is, their function is to prescribe how certain words or symbols are to be used. While pre-occupied with this sort of linguistic analysis, it is to be noted that philosophical problems are not about language, they are clearly about philosophical concepts. What is argued here, however, is that these problems spring from language, reveal the confusion as to the uses of language and are to be solved or removed by employing language properly. This decisive point will bring an end to the fruitless conflict of systems inherent in some traditional philosophical problems. We are at present in possession of methods which make every such conflict in principle unnecessary. Now it is clear, how linguistic philosophers, in spite of their difference views on interpretation, try to endeavor to formulate a common program, that is a search for a method, which would help in the establishment of genuine philosophical propositions by means of conceptual analysis. If we recall the philosophical method employed by Radhakrishnan we find a close similarity. For Radhakrishnan, the method of philosophical investigation is different from a logical, formal or empirical science.

Radhakrishnan's form is transcendental which aims at the mode of knowing objects rather than objects, similar to what analytic philosophers call conceptual analysis (Landesman, 1997, p. 176).

Suppose intuitive elements are considered to be the ground of possible experience, for Radhakrishnan these are categories of fundamental concepts. Then what would be the medium of expression of those fundamental concepts? These innate possibilities cannot simply be considered as introspective contents because it would lead to a form of psychologism of the type which Locke and Descartes accepted. For Radhakrishnan, the psychological methods are considered to be inadequate as a solution for philosophical problems as he completely synthesized the question of origin with those which relate to value. This trend of thought in Radhakrishnan is a rejection of the physiology of mind of Locke. The distinction between questions of fact and questions of meaning needs to be removed from philosophical investigation for a better understanding of philosophy itself. If questions of fact are to be accepted as the only concern, then the idea of innate possibilities as introspectable states would never arise because as a philosophical concept their status would be not be empirical.

If the medium of expression of those intuitive elements are not mental states and dispositions, which would be factual questions, then what would be the medium of that kind of clarification? The medium would therefore be one in which the fundamental conditions are expressed by necessarily ordinary language (Gallagher, 1982, pp. 100-101). Broadly speaking, two groups of linguistic philosophers, Ideal Linguists and Ordinary Linguists, talk about the world by means of using a suitable language. Their fundamental concern relates to the method, on which ordinary language and ideal

language agree. Equally and fundamentally they disagree on what is a "language" and what makes it "suitable" (Ibid, p. 102). However, the concern is not to point out the distinctive features of the debate between ordinary and ideal language, but the outcome is definitely a clear indication of the solution of philosophical problems by means of language analysis. If the method adopted by both is the same, then the question arises as to why "ordinary language" should be preferred as the medium of expression of a meta-theory, instead of an "ideal language". To this my submission would be that the starting point in ordinary language, whose distinctive feature is to begin with common and plain language for communication is very close and similar to Radhakrishnan. For Radhakrishnan, the language of the categories of an intuitive experience is ordinary; therefore, the meta-theory which is being considered must be a theory of everyday experience. This explanation of the possible conditions of human experience is not at all an artificial conceptual system. The main purpose of this critique is to deduce these principles which describe the general nature of the objects given in experience by showing that they describe necessary conditions of the possibility of experience. With this theme in mind, a discussion of Austin is needed, in order to see why ordinary language should be the medium of expression of philosophical investigations.

The methodology of Analytic Philosophy gets somewhat more specific in the writings of J.L. Austin (1979). For example, he is very critical of the conventional handling of epistemological themes through an obsessive repletion of just a few words, fact and examples treated as standards in "Sense and Sensibilia" (p.63). His main remedy is to attend more carefully to the distinction operative in our ordinary forms of speech. In order to carry out his intended program, he adopts a close investigation of

ordinary language as his method. A close examination of language would be at least a "begin-all" if not an "end-all", which is mostly found in his papers; "A Plea for Excuses", (pp. 175-204) and "Three ways of Spilling Ink", (pp. 272 - 287).

Austin's central concern is with ordinary language, the language spoken prior to specialist theorizing, and the language of the "plain man". He argued that ordinary language already contains finer and subtler distinctions that are often realized, and if those are explored in preference to artificial language then it may be possible to reach agreement and make some progress in philosophical discussion (Ibid, pp. 175ff.).

> Our common stock of words embodied all the distinctions men have found with drawing the connections they have found worth making, in the lifetimes of many generations. These surely are likely to be more numerous, more sound, since they have stood up to the long test of the survival of the fittest, and more subtle, at least in all ordinary and reasonably practical matters, that any that you or I are like to think up in our arm-chairs of an afternoon-the most favored, alternative method... (Ibid, p. 182)

He continued further to assert that,

> In view of the prevalence of the slogan 'ordinary language' and of such names as 'linguistic' or 'analytic' philosophy or 'the analysis of language', one thing needs specially emphasizing to counter misunderstandings. When we examine what we should say when, what words we should use in what situations, we are looking again not merely at words (or 'meanings', whatever they may be) but also at the realities we use the words to talk about; we are using a sharpened awareness of words to sharpen our perception of, though not as the final arbiter of, the phenomena. (Ibid, p. 182)

In the above passages which are central to an understanding of Austin's approach to philosophy, the argument is not merely that we need to examine ordinary language so that we are clear on what we are rejecting if we reject it, it is rather that there is reason for not rejecting it. To put it in other words, the Indian concept of intuitive knowledge that

Radhakrishnan operates with has a claim to superiority for otherwise it would not have survived, but would have been replaced by a more adequate one. After consideration of the distinctive guidelines of ordinary languages, it is now clear why it should to be taken as the medium of expression of the meta-theory.

Now one more aspect of the methodology remains to be seen, i.e. what would be the results of such an investigation? P.F.Strawson's *Individuals*: *An Essay In Descriptive Metaphysics* defines the major conditions for another stage of the Analytic Movement in the development of my interpretation of intuitive thought. The conception of metaphysics of experience is concerned with the general conditions of the employment of concepts and of the recognition of the particular contents of experience as having some general character.

> Our natural beliefs are the products of the conceptual framework of the original understanding when applied to our sense experiences. With that conceptual framework of thought is the claim that there are material objects, and that those objects large enough to be seen have colors. What we already think as a result of our conceptual scheme is that here are colored objects. No wonder we cannot help think that the tomato is red when we look at it. That it is red is an instance of an ingrained way of thinking, a way of thinking that is likely to be the result of human evolution and that may very well be either innate or so deeply ingrained as to be ineliminable. Even if I convince myself that there are no colored objects, I will be unable to cease believing that tomatoes are red, lemons are yellow, and snow white. (Landesman, 1997, p. 43)

Radhakrishnan's fundamental conditions of ordinary or empirical self-consciousness have a close similarly with the Strawsonian distinction between *descriptive* and *reversionary metaphysics.* It is this distinction that permits us to consider Strawson in light of the kinds of contextual and thematic metaphysical conditions, as described by Radhakrishnan.

In defense of transcendental metaphysics, if the meta-theory's execution may appear to be doubtful, but these doubts are proved to be unjustified and a genuine inquiry of this kind is possible, then it fully deserves the title of metaphysics. Its method would be non-empirical, not because, like transcendent metaphysics, it claims to be concerned with a realm of objects inaccessible to experience, but because it is concerned with the conceptual structure which is pre-supposed in all empirical inquiry.

Strawson suggests that there are different primary meanings of metaphysics (Strawson, 1959, p. 10). Out of these, my concern is with descriptive metaphysics because the results of the investigation undertakes in an attempt to establish the supposed meta-theory is the same. If the intuitive elements considered to be the grounds of possible experience form a conceptual system, which is pre-supposed in all our knowledge, then descriptive metaphysics would be the only logical result because it inspects the concepts and methods required in examining the possible conditions of human experience.

Hence, descriptive metaphysics becomes the only factor to explain conceptual systems, which is involved in any actual claim for knowledge, whether logical or informal. The claims of descriptive metaphysics will have a peculiar necessity about them. They are not necessary in the sense of logic, but they are necessary because they are pre-supposed in all knowledge, which is in our conceptual system. Thus, to deny such propositions would be unintelligible. Even the idea of descriptive metaphysics is liable to be met with skepticism. Skeptics, however critical they may be, can make descriptive metaphysics their target, because they cannot simply talk about anything without having a conceptual system. Therefore, Strawson writes,

> The point is not that we must accept this conclusion in order to avoid skepticism, but that we must accept in order to explain the existence of a conceptual scheme in terms of which the skeptical problem is stated. But once the conclusion is accepted the skeptical problem does not arise. So with many skeptical problems: their statement involved the pretended acceptance of a conceptual scheme and at the same time the silent repudiation of one of the conditions of its existence. (Passmore, 1975, p. 186)

Hence the peculiar necessity of philosophical propositions is that their denial would be unintelligible but not contradictory (in that case this would be analytical but this is not so). So skepticism is not false but unintelligible. Therefore, descriptive metaphysics is an indefensible part of an explanation of the non-empirical conditions of human experience, which would be a transcendental necessity.

Now to look back for a brief observation, it is found that the meta-theory, which aims at the explanation of non-empirical conditions of human experience, begins with a conceptual analysis as its method and eventually progressed within ordinary language as its medium of expression and finally resulted in a form of meta-physics, which even a skeptic cannot question. This becomes possible when Schlick brought about a turning point of philosophy and opened an era where the philosopher is free from all sorts of factual claims, but is accountable to meta-questions. Wittgenstein then prepared the way for the enlargement of its scope and Austin strengthened it by showing that there is a transcendental way of asking about the basis of possibility and relationships, in our sensing of things. Ultimately Strawson enabled analytic philosophy to take on the dimensions of the range of problems which determine the direction of philosophy towards descriptive metaphysics.

3.6 Conclusion

The doctrine of intuition that has been developed from a consolidation of Western philosophic perspectives is found to be clearer and have maintained its similarity to Radhakrishnan in spite of cultural differences. With Radhakrishnan, it is obvious that the problem of the doctrine of intuition is not to question the genesis of ideas but to search after the possible conditions of human experience. Perceiving the doctrine this way naturally removes from it all sorts of factual claims and concentrates attention upon the mode of organizing or synthesizing experience itself. Hence this manner or mode of synthesis itself becomes the innate-element, which is not an empirical or psychological synthesis, rather it is a transcendental integration. As this cannot be studied by traditional methods available, a method unique in its structure has to be sought after and that is no other than the meta-theory suggested.

This method of studying the structure of transcendental integration would naturally demand from us, an account of the cognitive capacity of the mind. It would enable us to know the description of the fundamental structure of human experience and the distinct features of its methodology in an analytic manner. As a response to these demands, I have suggested three possible branches of philosophy, mainly Piaget's genetic-epistemology, Husserl's phenomenology, and Analytical Philosophy. In order to exhibit in more detail the transcendental implications of Radhakrishnan regarding the mode of human experience; genetic-epistemology supplies the "synthesis" and exhibits the contents of the cognitive capacity of the mind; Husserl defines the structure of transcendentalism in a phenomenological manner by reducing the experience to its essence; and finally Analytical Philosophy, where results similar to the *Descriptive*

Metaphysics of Strawson describes the distinctive features of the methodology concerned.

Thus, the meta-theory suggested for the possible condition of human experience seems to be well clarified by these philosophies. But, if we look back, we would find two prominent questions might be raised here. One would be concerning the attack on psychologism and the other regarding the possibility of the transcendental subject. I would try to answer both questions taking genetic-epistemology into account and would conclude the discussion with a humble note regarding further tasks to be undertaken.

The rejection of psychologism becomes more prominent in the later part of Husserl's phenomenology and the Analytical Philosophers. This attack, particularly in its empirical aspect (psychology and epistemology), is not valid since psychology is an empirical science dealing with the empirical self as a phenomenon among other phenomena, while epistemology is the science of reason itself, dealing with *a priori* principles on which the possibility of all phenomena depends. As a result, I do not propose an investigation of how man's sensory organs function or how sensations arise. If it were that, it would be part of psychology, namely the psychology of sensations. If it were that, its results could be verified only by recourse to observation and the principles which it reached would be empirical. Therefore in metaphysical logic, I do not propose an investigation of how all people always think. If it were that, it would be a part of psychology and could not establish any results *a priori*. Hence, I investigated whether there are conditions by which thinking is founded, if people were to attain by their thoughts knowledge of things. I contended that Lock failed to ascertain whether or not, and if so, how metaphysical knowledge is possible, because he tried to settle this matter

by psychology and hence by an empirical investigation. Similarly, I proposed not an investigation of how sensations arise, but of the necessary conditions to which our sensations are subject.

Analytic philosophers like Husserl emphasized the necessity of a clear distinction between empirical psychological problems and non-empirical logical problems. It holds that we find the traces of subjectivism in the logical system itself, in the discussion of logical problems, mixed with objective logical concepts, hence, the result is inevitably confusion. Therefore to avoid confusion, Analytic philosophers categorically emphasized that no psychological explanation could be the ground of the necessary truth of judgments: Sensations cannot be the ground of necessary truths.

Regarding the second question, the possibility of a transcendental subject or transcendental ego, we find that though it has been accepted by both Radhakrishnan and Husserl, Strawson was dubious about its status (Strawson, 1959, p.32). In the hands of both Husserl and Radhakrishnan, we have the transcendental method with rejection of psychologism, which resulted in the postulation of a transcendental subject because both ruled out empirical science as the subject matter of philosophy. Hence, it becomes clear here that only the anti-psychologism of Husserl impelled him to admit a transcendental subject. This does not seem to derive from merely the metaphysical method. Therefore, if we can overcome anti-psychologism, it would be possible to use the transcendental method without a transcendental subject. Even the status of the subject seems to be peculiar to Strawson, as he claimed the subject of the transcendental psychology to be "imaginary" (Ibid p. 32).

Piaget's genetic-epistemology seems to answer the above two questions. The developmental psychology of Piaget suggests that psychology need not be understood purely as an empirical science as it has so often been; it has also its cognitive parts which contribute towards a new look in perception.

The cognitive function can be divided into two broad categories according to whether the "figurative" or "operative" aspects of knowledge predominate. The "figurative aspects" bear on its observable configurations while "operative aspects" by contrast bear on the transformation of one state into another and therefore include actions and operations, which both aim at the unobservable (Furth, 1969, p. 86). Of these two, in the realm of perception, operative aspects play a much greater part. The importance of operative factors lies in stressing the function of "perceptual categorizing". Piaget emphasized this cognitive aspect of psychology. Those who have attacked psychologism also follow the same cognitive structure (Ibid, p. 180). Hence, the questions of cognitive structure cannot be ruled out from any type of epistemology whatsoever it may be. To examine the possible epistemologies in this context, we find the empiricist tradition. Those who have recourse to psychology were content with common sense ideas with speculative descriptions because of the influence of experimental psychology, which prevented them from seeing that experience is always a process of assimilation to existing structures. Epistemologies, even those what are anti-empiricist, raise questions of facts and thus implicitly adopt psychological positions which lack effective verification even though this is indispensable as far as a sound method is concerned. Therefore, to conceive of a satisfactory explanation of human experience, a consideration

of cognitive structure is essential because, relative to the contents of behavior, the schemata are *a priori* and it is this which makes experience possible.

This acceptance of psychological elements in explaining the possibility of human experience rules out the postulation of a transcendental subject because it was the anti-psychologism, which was responsible for such acceptance. In terms of Piaget's cognitive psychology, it is the "epistemic subject', which is required to make human experience possible by means of its operations behavior. For Piaget, the very notion of a transcendental subject is nothing but that of an epistemic subject. Therefore, Piaget rightly said in connection with Husserl, "Husserl's fundamental mistake lay in the fact that his transcendental subject is still a subject and that "pure intuition' is still the activity of a subject (in which the "object" or "essence", admittedly enter in, but if there is, intuition there is, nonetheless, a subject). It follows that, "transcendental or empirical, reference to such intuition is still psychologism, that is to say, a passage from fact to norm" (Piaget, 1972, p. 104). The very assumption of the epistemic subject, therefore, eliminates the notion of a transcendental subject, in order to account for transcendental cognition. Thus, we would have a transcendental method without pre-supposing a transcendental subject.

In the light of the above position, if we go back to the basic notion of Radhakrishnan's view of intuition, that is the synthesizing or organizing activity of the mind in making human experience possible, we find that this notion has been well clarified by the triangular contribution of genetic-epistemology, phenomenology and analytic philosophy. The schematic operation which makes assimilation possible by means of the assimilation and accommodation mechanism constitutes the most

fundamental ingredient of intellectual functioning and their synthesis is considered to be the ground of possibility of experience. Those conditions which are involved in this "integration" are considered as the non-empirical conditions of human experience in the Radhakrishnan sense, and those conditions are considered to be essential for whatever type of experience it may be, because the organization of these conditions are necessarily preliminary to all experience. Hence, it is in this sense, i.e. the description of this mode or synthesis, is considered that we can speak of "intuition" and not any product. This synthesis never needs transcendence for an explanation in spite of its being transcendental, because this transcendental synthesis is within the reach of the epistemic subject. Otherwise, this "integration" is natural but its function is transcendental. Therefore, a new understanding of the intuition as synthesis can be had in the purified form of a meta-theory without transcendence.

This is certainly a beginning venture in searching for an adequate solution of some problems of a theory of knowledge: the discussion has been mainly concerned with how one should properly formulate and construct these problems. I have been trying to concentrate upon certain essential conceptual, methodological and epistemological preliminaries which must be considered first, before we can state the basic issues in a theory of knowledge properly. Consequently, my main concern is not so much with a theory of intuitive ideas, as with a theory of intuition.

It is evident that a risk has been taken in suggesting a theory. The risk, namely that epistemological consequence may follow from psychology. If the answer is positive, then the controversial problem of psychologism would be solved. But apart from this many more questions may arise, which I will not pursue here, but I can at least submit

that in this thesis an attempt is being made to discover an alternative method, for this reason, a risk is inevitable. And so, I conclude my reflections with a remark of Wittgenstein, "As regards his own work, he said it did not matter whether his results were true or not: what matters was that 'a method has been found'" (Moore, 1959, p. 322).

3.7 Further Research

I certainly do not wish to imply or suggest that there are no more problems left or questions yet to be raised and answered. On the contrary, I am only too well aware of the fact that there are so many more clarifications needed. For example, in addition to the problem of pyschologism, there is the status of the transcendental subject which requires further study. As I try to sketch a possible way of dealing with these questions, I am quite aware that they demand more extensive and prolonged treatment, which I hope to return to and continue in my future research.

The change of perspective which this new insight of Upanisadic wisdom is likely to affect may breathe new life into what otherwise looks like a sterile epistemological issue of no consequences. The reader may also be convinced that contrary to what is generally believed about Eastern philosophers they are not impractical dreamers who spend much of their time meditating on lofty abstractions and who do have something to offer for the ills of the modern day. It is of course true philosophical speculation has been carried to a very high point in India, but the practical side has also been cultivated and a great deal of social life has been permeated by pragmatism. In epistemology, this has been reflected in the ideals by which a holistic view is undertaken and underlies life, never leaving it out of sight. This view of life rests ultimately on values. Hence it is

regarded as essential that a pupil's life should be lived in an environment permeated by idealistic values.

The place that values occupy in life is so important that no philosopher can omit to take account of them. But this does not mean that they will always receive the amount of attention, which their importance demands. In Western philosophy, ever since the time of Descartes and Locke, the scientific method has usurped the place afforded to idealism. It is only in recent times that due to social strife arising out of a consequence of the divorce of philosophy from life, there has been a gradual shifting of interest to this problem of the lack of values. One of the distinguishing features of Indian philosophy is that, throughout its long history, it has consistently given the foremost place to values. In ancient literature, this problem receives almost exclusive attention. For example, the Upanisads speak more often of the final goal of life, the means to its attainment and the inner peace and joy which it signifies than of "being" or of "knowing" as much. The recognition of its importance by Indian thinkers has not meant that they treat value as the subject matter of only a particular branch of philosophy. Rather it inspired their investigation as a whole, and its influence was seen in every department of philosophic thought. Indian philosophy may, on this account be described as essentially a philosophy of values. The purpose of the next chapter is to provide the role that values can play in our contemporary problems. As in the case of the doctrine of intuition investigated in Indian philosophy, there is here also much diversity of opinion but the underlying aim remains throughout.

3.8 Discussion of the Local Problem

The main purpose of my dissertation has been to trace the ancient Indian view of knowledge and emphasize some of the ideals which it rests upon. No attempt has been made to be exhaustive, or to show all the bearings which Indian ideals have on present conditions. This would need another dissertation to itself. Nevertheless, in education as in other phases of social life, mingling of East and West is not only inevitable but desirable. Time alone will determine if this can be done with the least possible friction.

It may not, however, be out of place to indicate what seems to me the plane upon which Western and Indian thought may best be brought together and be pragmatically applied to the scorn presently facing the Indo-Canadian community. If the modest aim of searching for innate knowledge succeeds, then some progress may hopefully be made in also finding solutions to the issue of Indo-Canadian gang violence which has left behind so many devastated families by leading their young boys into blind allies. From an evaluation and systematic understanding of the contemporary issue, it is clear that an elixir consisting of the prominent elements of Indian philosophy is possible. Such a mixture will not be the panacea for all the community's ills, but may provide the solution for some. It is difficult to draw such a blueprint in detail, however, an attempt of an outline will be provided.

Indo-Canadian youth stand alienated from the mainstream community in the aftermath of the gangland murders and criminal activity that has occurred in the last 10 years. The root causes of the process of this alienation, accelerated by the onslaught of media attention, stretch back to certain sociological factors that need to be analyzed in depth. The point is that the ideological dimension of the situation today needs to be well analyzed and projected for a proper understanding of the contemporary social reality in

the Lower Mainland. The key to an abiding solution lies in a perspective that would facilitate the positive integration of youth with the mainstream community. This perspective is essential for the preservation of the youth's own identity on the one hand, and the unity and integrity of the larger Indian community on the other hand. From the very beginning, the development of an Indian identity contained an inherent predicament for the young when choosing between two paths – traditional or Western. This contradiction was sought to be synthetically resolved in the pattern of the Canadian mosaic, which can be considered as a middle path. But this synthesis, like all dialectical synthesis, meant only a transmutation of the original contradiction and not its permanent resolution. Indians adopt and adapt to sociological structures and institutions, as these had emerged during an earlier phase of their migration into British Columbia in the early 1970s. Their earlier assimilation was structured on a homogenized social base in which all diversities – religious, linguistic, ethnic, etc, were sublated into a unity euphemistically known as a mosaic. The transplantation of Western structures and institutions into the Indian psyche brought with it its own orientation of pluralism. The bearing of this re-oriented dialectic sharpened in the past few years with Punjabis accentuating their identity crisis in more than one way.

The super-imposed structures and institution of the Western stereotype, characteristic of the classical phase of capitalism, in view of the imperatives of a homogenized social base envisaged only corporate integration of the community, rather than the individual integration into the larger mainstream community. Hence a paradoxical situation arose, particularly in the case of the young. These youths were getting progressively integrated into the national system of social, economic and cultural

levels, but as corporate beings. On the individual level, the youth were getting alienated. The make-up of community elders in the temples as well as social activists at this time had failed to discover this paradox and identify its causes. And 20 years later, the tragic events become realized a la the Orwellian manner that what we believed to be progress towards integration was in fact regress into alienation.

The essence of the issue is that of changing forms of self-realization on individual and corporate levels with the correlated question of integration with the mainstream community. The above mentioned simplistic description is at worst superficial and at best only a half-truth which does not yield a complete perspective of the real nature of the problem as this question of self-realization has cropped up from time to time in the annals of Punjab's history. In the modern period, it has arisen in the process of Indians becoming self-conscious for the first time in this process of self-identity. This self awareness is partly a result of the Punjabi community's multi-dimensional encounter with other religious, linguistic and ethnic communities not only in Canada but elsewhere as well, including India. The quest for self-realization should be understood, pursued and accommodated in a positive manner by both the Indians and non-Indians.

But luckily we have not reached the point of no return. The mainstream consciousness among the youth still genuinely seeks to be in unison with the larger body, which considers itself to also be an integral part of the much larger community. In this context it is essential to understand that contemporary youth, are becoming self-conscious in the process of self-realization. This consciousness of individual self-identity should not be confused with the so-called group-identity, but should rather be distinguished from the latter, appreciated and respected as such. This self-awareness is a natural phenomenon in

the course of ethno-social development of a community. Similarly, the problem of individual integration in particular and the Indian community in general was faced by Guru Nanak himself when he embarked upon the course of introducing a new socio-politico-religious entity in the form of Sikhism into mainstream India. The solution provided by Guru Nanak is in a sense, a forerunner to the Upanishadic condition of unity in diversity which characterizes the Indian model of epistemological integration, a model in which identity and integration, unity and diversity are not mutually exclusive but complementary to each other.

So far we have been dealing with the answer to the question of the "why" regarding this present affliction. Now we shall concentrate on the "who" and "how", and see how Indian philosophy tackles these questions.

Who is responsible for this state of affairs? Our community, religious and political leaders have ignored the synthesis of the social, religious and political institutions inherited from our historical tradition with the social structures that have come from integrating with Western communities. *The least that one can do is to foster dialogue or provide a perspective on the problem in particular and situation in general. This would be a much needed step towards bridging the communication gap between Indians and the larger community. A dispassionate, ideological analysis of the basics issues would, it is hoped change the heat of confused and confusing controversy into the light of enlightened dialogue.* The local problem which once was only a question of economics, some of which concerned Punjabis as a whole, has reached a stage, where it has turned into almost total alienation of young Indian men from the mainstream.

This is only one instance of the crisis, which the Indian community finds itself in today. To overcome this and any future crisis, we can interpret the essential metaphysical concepts of the Upanishads in the modern perspective and work to understand their sociological significance in the context of contemporary social reality that throws up certain complex and difficult situations.

We now turn to the "how" which would be concerned with the solution. A solution requires a method, a plan which would be concerned with the construction of a program which is necessary for the proper development of a young person's identity, the would-be citizens of our community.

3.9 Contemporary Application of Indian Philosophy

Indian philosophy has given an all round and integrated picture of human nature. Every disenfranchised youth must be seen from every perspective and should be remembered that each element in their nature has a right for full freedom and development. Not only the rational but also the infra-rational and the supra-rational aspects of human nature must find a place in a human scheme of knowledge. Ancient Indian philosophers, following the Upanisadic tradition, handed down the best that can be thought of in the form of epistemological values. While the body and intellect are considered, so must be the soul. Our methodology therefore must provide opportunities and facilities for the fullest development of all these different aspects. Contemporary education can be integrated (humanized) in so far as we provide for a wide based curriculum. There should be mandatory teaching of science, arts, literature along with moral, religious, spiritual, and ethics courses. Thus, no part of human development should be left out of the curriculum. Indian philosophy not only anecdotes the value of

sense training and physical education along with academic, moral, and religious education, but emphasizes it as necessary for the all round development of the wayward youth.

How shall the Indian ideals be applied to modern education and culture in the West ? The first requisite for this is that the age-old relationship between the Sacred and education which Indians live by must be brought back in the community. An integrated philosophy is ideal if the ends and the means provided are synchronized and meant for all. Indian philosophy stands this test very boldly since the ultimate aim that is envisaged is self-realization, is attainable by everyone, and is "a source of illumination giving us a correct lead in the various spheres of live" (Altekar, 1957, p. 4). A method of reaching the highest goal is through reflection of one's values and the inner self of one's being. It can be practiced by anyone belonging to any race, religion or creed. However, as it is not so much spiritual as philosophical in origin, its practice would not be affected by most young people's disdain for religion as per an article in The *Vancouver Sun* by respected columnist Douglas Todd that read, "Religion just doesn't seem hip" (Todd, 1999). There can be no doubt, however, that the development of Indian philosophical ideals should be wholeheartedly embraced by Western educational thought and practiced immediately.

A person naturally feels a need to realize their true nature - the knowledge of the self. Every effort by a person in this world is directed to fulfill the needs of that nature. This is the highest value which one can realize. Though people have to realize their inner nature, they should not overlook their other human aspects; they cannot neglect the requirements of their physical being. One has a body, therefore it has to be kept in perfect

form in order that it may help and not put a hindrance in realizing their essential nature. Since young people have a strong social nature, their acts have significance both for themselves and for society. The need to develop character involves the codes of morality. Since people have an aesthetic nature, they need to enjoy things of beauty and if possible to create for themselves things of art; since they have an emotional nature, they must be able to find completion in the senses; since they have intelligence, they must be directed in the right channels so that the may carry on and cultivate knowledge; since they have the power of thinking, they must use such thinking as to rise above the petty interests of their deviant behavior and feel themselves a part of the larger community. They need some kind of philosophy that integrates all of the above. All of these are needed for the complete development of a person's personality and constitute the objectives of their learning and living. A person cannot do without them, and therefore these can also be regarded as practical objectives. Since the dawn of civilization, from the ancient Indian rishis to Western ultra-modern philosophers, all have recognized these objectives in one form or another.

In order to be a complete person, a person needs the all round development of their inherent powers, and since the prevailing system of education neglects this important factor, there needs to be a return to these ideals. Therefore, "man-making" (used in the generic sense) should be the essential aim of education. As Swami Vivekananada boldly asserted, "Education is not the amount of information that is put into your brain, and runs riot there, undigested all your life...If education were identical with information, then libraries would be greatest sages in the world and encyclopaedias, the rishis" (Vivekananada, 1997, Vol. I, p. 306). Education that does not help the

common mass of people to equip themselves for life, which does not bring out strength of character, a spirit of philanthropy and the courage of a lion – is it worth the name (Ibid, Vol. II, p. 145). Thus, in Vivekananada's words, "We want that education by which character is formed, strength of mind is increased, the intellect is expanded and by which one can stand on one's own feet" (Ibid, Vol. V, p. 257).

With a firm grounding in the Vedantic philosophy, all knowledge whether secular or spiritual is inherent in an individual and can be harvested. The Law of Gravitation did not wait for Newton to come into existence; it was already there in his mind and Newton only discovered it when its time came. Therefore, in psychological language, "to learn" is "to discover". All knowledge and all power are in the human soul, but it remains covered. When the covering is being taken off, "We are learning, and the advance of knowledge is made by this uncovering. The person from who this veil is being lifted is the more knowing person. The person upon whom it lies thick is ignorant. Liking fire to a piece of flint, knowledge exists in the mind, suggestion is the friction which brings it out" (Ibid, Vol. I, p. 26). In the case of Newton, the falling of an apple was the suggestion, which revived in his mind all previous links of thought allowing him to finally discover a new link that he termed the Law of Gravitation. "All knowledge comes from the soul. Man manifests knowledge, discovers it within himself which is pre-existing, through eternity" (Ibid, Vol. I. p. 421). The ancient rishis based their educational discipline on the fundamental conception of the human soul where all knowledge is and has to be evoked from inside by a clear goal through self-realization rather than instilled from outside.

While talking of the infinite goal, Indian philosophy does not neglect the immediate objectives of life, the values without which man cannot do in the temporal

impasse. Values of like are determined by the requirements of human nature. What are they? Part of the list of values of human beings: health, character, social justice, skill, art, love, knowledge, philosophy and religion, all form the completion of the person. These immediate objectives, taking the broadest sense of the term are practical objectives, which determine the objectives of a person's learning and living.

A pertinent though puzzling problem crops up here regarding the essential status of these values as assigned to them by different philosophies. Naturalistic philosophies, including realism and pragmatism deny them any cosmic constitution and consider them only as new creations contingent upon mainly temporally dependence. However, Indian philosophy elevates them to the cosmic statue believing as they do essentially in a supra-temporal, spiritual, eternal, independent, infinite and perfect order of existence, the prototype of which the entire terrestrial types are but with so many imperfect reflections. It ardently adheres to the idea of a perfect and *a priori* realization, in some everlasting, ceaseless, and unchanging divine experience. Of all such human values which but temporally express that immortal order of pure ideas and ideals, these values do not go begging for its being but eternally and essentially inheres their own supreme sacred self.

Such a view is supported by reason, and common sense. Since something cannot come out of nothing, a person's finite values, which are a fact, must come out of an infinite reservoir of ideal values says reason, and common sense corroborates the conclusion that life is best lived when based on influential ideals like honour, faith, truth, patience and hope. The purpose of all knowledge it is admitted by thinkers of East and West is to provide a coherent picture of the universe and an integrated way of life. We must obtain thorough a sense of intuitive apprehension, a synoptic vision, a *Samanyaya*

(reconciliation) of an integrated philosophy that synthesizes not only an aim and view of knowledge but of life. Humankind cannot live by a mass of disconnected information. We have a passion for an ordered vision of the connections of things. Life is one in all of its varied manifestations. We may study the factual relations of the different manifestations but we must have knowledge of life as a whole.

EPILOGUE

It is my belief that knowledge is to be viewed and reflected from the standpoint of the present but also from that of the past in both Western and Eastern circles, with suggestions for its future. It was a decisive and intentional decision not to provide in-depth or longitudinal research on the doctrine of intuition in either the West or East. As I have only briefly touched upon a few of the greatest philosopher's views on intuitive knowledge, it is obvious that my research has not been exhaustive. I have designed this dissertation paper mainly as an outline to bridge a link between Western and Indian thought, I hope that it will inspire those in most need to seek true solace and guidance from the Upanisad writings. It is up to the reader to judge the extent to which have succeed in my professed objective. However, I will feel amply rewarded if a study of this work stimulates one, even one, to re-think the direction of his or her life and make a concerted effort of change. This crisis in the Lower Mainland is thus not only an issue which is peripherally skin deep but fundamentally soul deep. Material wealth is welcome, but without *hinsa*, social justice and feeling of fraternity is void. Self-realization will become fallacious, if not impossible, in the absence of serious reflection upon the nature, aims and aspirations of the individuals. Thus, my dissertation has attempted to generate such a reflection by re-visiting Indian philosophy of knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, R. (1955). *John Locke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Aaron, R. (1971). *Knowing and the function of reason*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Anscombe, G.E. and P. Geach, Ed., (1975) *Descartes' philosophical writings*. London: "Perception and immortality in the nouveaux essais", Nichollas Jolley, Journal of the History of philosophy, April 1978, Vol. XVI, No. 2, p. 189.

Anscombe, G.E, (1968). *Ludwig Wittgenstein, philosophical investigations*. Macmillan: New York.

Aurobindo, S. (1951). *The renaissance in India*. Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram

Aurobindo, S. (1986). *The Upanishadic texts, translations and commentaries*. Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram.

Aurobindo, S. (1952). *Integral education. compiled by Dr. Indra Sen*. Pondicherry, New Delhi: Sri Aurobindo International University Centre.

Austin, J. (1979). "three ways of spilling ink" "a plea for excuses", "sense and sensibilia". *Philosophical papers*. In (Eds.). J. O. Urmson and G. J. Warnock Oxford: Oxford. University Press.

Altekar. A.S. (1957). *Education in ancient India*. Varanasi: Nand Kishore.

Ayer, A.Y. (1956). *The problem of knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ayer, A.J. (1959). *Logical positivism*. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press.

Banerjee, N. V. (1974). *The spirit of Indian philosophy*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann Publishers.

Bell, D. (1990). *Husserl*. London: Routledge.

Bhattacharya, S., (1987). *Doubt, Belief and Knowledge*. New Delhi: ICPR and Allied.

Bishop, D.H. (1975). *Indian thought: an introduction*. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Private Ltd.

Bosanquet, B. (1911). *Logic or Morphology of Knowledge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chakrabarti, K. K. (1999). *Classical Indian philosophy of mind: the Nyaya dualist tradition*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chakravarty, D. K. (1998). *Perspectives in contemporary philosophy.* Delhi: Ajanta Publications.

Chatterjea, T. (2003). *Knowledge and freedom in Indian philosophy.* New York: Lexington Books.

Chatterjee, S. and Dhirendramohan Datta, (1954). *An introduction to Indian philosophy.* Calcutta: Calcutta University Press.

Chennakesavan, S. (1976). *Concepts of Indian philosophy.* New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Cole, G.D.H., (1950). *Essays in social theory.* London: Macmillan & Co.

Copleston, F. (1962). *A history of philosophy.* Vol. IV Garden City, New York: Image Books.

Coster, G. (1957). *Yoga and western psychology: a comparison.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Coward, H. G. (1983). *Studies in Indian thought.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Crimmins, M.(1992). *Talk about beliefs.* Cambridge: The Massachusetts Press.

Dalvi, R., & Deutsch, E. (2004). *The essential Vedanta: a new source book of Advaita Vedanta.* Indiana: World Wisdom Inc.

Das Gupta, S.N. (1933). *Indian idealism.* Cambridge, England: University Press.

Datta, D.M. (1972). *The six ways of knowing A critical study of the Advaita theory of knowledge.* Calcutta; University of Calcutta.

Dewey, J. (1953). *Democracy and education.* New York: Macmillan.

Doney, W. (1968). *Descartes.* Modern Studies in Philosophy Series. London: MacMillian.

Todd, D., Feb 6, 1999. The Vancouver Sun, p. Dl

Easwaran, E. (1992) *Dialogue with death: journey through consciousness.* Tomales, California: Nilgiri Press.

Engel, S.M. (1971). *Wittgenstein's doctrine of the tyranny of language.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. (actual translation by D.P. Pears and B.F. McGuinness, 4.0031, 6, B. from Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico – Philosophicus*).

Everson, S. (1990). *Companions to ancient thought: epistemology.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferre, F. (1998). *Knowing and value, toward a constructive postmodern epistemology.* Albany: State University of New York.

Flavell, J. (1963). *The developmental psychology of Jean Piaget. part one, the theory.* Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand Company.

Fraser, A. (1959). *An essay concerning human understanding. Vol. I, II.* New York: Dover Publications.

Frede, M. (1990). An empiricist view of knowledge. In Stephen Everson (Ed), *Companions to ancient thought: epistemology.* New York: Cambridge University.

Friedlander, P. (1958). *Plato. Translated from German by Hans Meyerhoff.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Furth, H.G. (1969). *Piaget and knowledge, theoretical foundations.* Englewoods Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Gallagher, K.T. (1982). *The philosophy of knowledge.* New York. Fordham: University Press.

Gautama, A. (1913). *Nyayasutra. sacred book of the Hindus English translation. Volume 8, 1.1.1.* Allahabad.

Gibson, B. (1932). *The philosophy of Descartes.* London: Mathuen & Co.

Gibson, J. (1968) . *Locke's theory of knowledge.* Cambridge: University Press.

Gough, E. (1979). *The philosophy of the Upanisads: ancient Indian metaphysics.* New Delhi: Cosmo.

Haldane, E. S. &. Ross, G. R. T. (1955). *The philosophical works of Descartes; rendered into English.* Volume I, III. New York: Dover Publications.

Helm, P. (1997). *Faith and understanding.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Herman, A.L. (1976). *An introduction to Indian thought.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hiriyanna, M. (1951). *Outlines of Indian philosophy.* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Holland, R.F. (1980). *Against empiricism. on education, epistemology and value.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hamlyn, D.W. (1961). *Sensations and perceptions.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Husserl, E. (2001). *The shorter logical investigations. Translation by J.N. Findley.* London: Routledge.

Husserl, E. (1952) *Ideas, general introduction to pure phenomenology, translated by W.R. Boyce Gibson.* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Hussey, E. (1990). The beginnings of epistemology; from Homer to Philolaus. In Stephen Everson (Ed), *Companions to ancient thought: epistemology.* New York: Cambridge University.

Iyangar, I. and Rangacharya, (1996). *Ramanuga, Sribhasya. 1.1.1, Vol. I, V. III translated.* Madras.

Joshi. K. (2002). *Philosophy of value-oriented education: theory and practice.* New Delhi: Indian Council for Philosophical Research.

Jowett, B. (1988). *Republic. V.I* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kant, I. (1961). *Critique of Pure Reason*, 2nd Edition trans. N.K. Smith, London: Macmillan.

Kattackal, J. (1980). *Religion and ethics in Advaita*. Freiburg: Herder

Keeling, S.V. (1968) *Descartes*. Oxford: University Press.

Lal, B. K. (1978). *Contemporary Indian philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Lamprecht, S. P. (1955). *Our philosophical traditions*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc.

Landesman, C. (1997). *An introduction to epistemology*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Lehrer, K. (1978). *Knowledge*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Locke, J. (1947). *An essay concerning human understanding*. London: John Beecroft.

Lott, E. (1980). *Vedantic approaches to God*. London: Macmillan.

Macdonald, P. (2000). *Descartes and Husserl, the philosophical project of radical beginnings*. Albany : State University of New York Press.

Maitra, S.K. (1947). *The spirit of Indian philosophy.* Benares, India: Benaras Hindu University.

Mehta, R. (1990). *The call of the Upanishads*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

McDermott, R.A. (1977). *The basic writings of S. Radhakrishnan*. Bombay: Jaico Publishing House.

Mohanty, J.N. (1993). *Essays on Indian philosophy.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Moore, C.A. (1967). *The Indian mind: essentials of Indian philosophy and culture.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Moore, G.E. (1959). *Philosophical papers*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Moran, D. (2000) *Introduction to phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

Morris, C.R. (1931). *Locke, Berkley, Hume*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Muirhead, J.H., & Radhakrishnan, S. (1929). *Contemporary Indian philosophy*. "The inward absolute and the activism of the finite self." London: George Allen & Unwin.

Muller, M., (2004) *Six systems of Indian Philosophy.* New Delhi: Chronicle

Murti, T.R. (1974). *The central philosophy of Buddhism: a study of the Madhyamika system.* London: Allen and Unwin

Olivelle, P. (1998). *The early Upanisads: annotated text and translation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Organ, T. W. (1964). *The self in Indian philosophy.* The Hague: Mouton and Co.

Organ, T. W. (1974). *Hinduism: its historical development.* London: Barron's Educational.

Ozman, H. & Craver, S. (1990). *Philosophical foundations of education.* Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.

Pappu, S.S.R.R. & R. Puligandla (1982). *Indian philosophy: past and future. Delhi:* Motilal Banarsidass.

Passmore, J. (1975). *A hundred years of philosophy.* New York: Penguin Books.

Penelhum, T. & MacIntosh, J.J. (1969). *The first critique.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Piaget, J. (1972). *Insights and Illusions of Philosophy.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Piaget, J. (1972). *The child and reality: problems of genetic psychology.* New York: Grossman Publishers.

Piaget, J. (1973). *Psychology and epistemologia: for a theory of the knowledge.* Rio De Janeiro: Forensic.

Piaget, J. (1978). *Success and understanding.* New York: Grossman Publishers.

Pulaski, M.S. (1972). *Understanding Piaget: an introduction to children's cognitive development.* New York: Harper & Row.

Pulaski, M.S. (1978). *Your baby's mind and how it grows : Piaget's theory for parents.* New York: Harper & Row

Pitcher, G. (1966). *Wittgenstein: the philosophical investigations.* Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co.

Prabhananda, S. (1977). *Vedic Religion and Philosophy.* Madras: Sri Rama Krishna Math.

Prajnanananda, S. (1973). *Schools of philosophical thought.* Calcutta: Firm K.L. Mukhopadhyay.

Prasad, J.S. (1998). *History of Indian epistemology.* New Delhi : Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Quine, W.V.O. (1960). *Word and object.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Radhakrishnan, S. (1980). *An idealist view of life.* 2nd edition 1937. London: Mandala Books, Unwin Paperbacks.

Radhakrishnan, S., & Muirhead, J.H. (1982). *Contemporary Indian philosophy.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Radhakrishnan, S. (1999). *Indian philosophy, Vol. 1,II* New Delhi:Oxford Printing Press.

Radhakrishnan, S. (1956). *My search for truth.* Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala,.

Radhakrishnan, S. (1955). *Recovery of faith.* New York: Harper and brothers.

Radhakrishnan, S. (1948). *The Bhagavad-Gita*, London: George Allen and Unwin

Raju, P.T. (1935). *"The outcry against comparative philosophy"* Aryan Path. Vol. 6. p. 98. Bombay Theosophy Co. (India), Ltd.

Raju, P.T. (1970). *Lectures on comparative philosophy.* Poona: University of Poona.

Raju, P.T. (1985). *Structural depths of Indian thought.* New Delhi: South Asian Publishers.

Raju, P.T. (1982). *Spirit, being and self: studies in Indian and Western philosophy.* New Delhi: South Asian Publishers.

Raju, P.T. (1971) *The philosophical traditions of India.* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Rakhe, S.E. (1992). *Education in ancient India.* Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications

Rao, B. S. (1998) *Theories of knowledge: a critique book II.* Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Richmond, P.G. (1971) *An introduction to Piaget.* New York: Basic Books Inc.,

Rorty, R. (1967). *Linguistic Turn.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ross, W. D. (1951). *Plato's theory of Ideas.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sahu, B. (2002). *The new educational philosophy.* New Delhi: Sarup and Sons.

Sagan, C. (1994). *Pale blue dot; a vision of the human future.* Toronto: Random House.

Sastri, P.S. (1975). *Indian idealism (epistemology and ontology) Vol. I.* Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.

Satprakashananda, S. (1965). *Methods of knowledge: perceptual, non-perceptual and transcendental.* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Schilpp, P. A. (1952) *The Philosophy of Radhakrishnan.* London: Tudor.

Schilpp, P. A. (1952) *Library of living philosophers.* London: Tudor.

Schopenhauer, A. (1883). *The world as will and idea. tr. from German, by R.B. Haldane and J. Kemp.* London: Trubner & Co.

Sharma, C. (1979). *A critical survey of Indian philosophy.* Delhi: Motilal Bararsidass

Shastri, P. D. (1928). *The essentials of eastern philosophy.* New York: The MacMillian Company.

Shearer, A., & Russell, P. (1978). *The Upanishads.* London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.

Singh, B. (1976). *The conceptual framework of Indian philosophy.* Delhi: The MacMillan Company.

Singh, J. (1990). *Verbal testimony in Indian philosophy.* Delhi: Parimal Publications.

Sinha, D. (1965). *The idealist standpoint: a study in the Vedantic metaphysic of experience.* Calcutta: Sri Gouranga Press.

Smith, H. (1992). *Beyond the post-modern mind.* New York: The Crossroads Publishing Company.

Smith, N.K. (1952). *Descartes' philosophical writings, selected and translated by Norman Kemp Smith.* London : Macmillan.

Smith, N.K. (1961). *Immanuel Kant's critique of pure reason translated by Norman Kemp Smith.* 1st Edition, 2nd Edition (1963) London : Macmillan.

Spiegelberg, H. (1971). *The phenomenological movement: a historical introduction. Vol I*, The Hague: Marinus Nijhoff.

Sorley, W.R. (1965). *A history of British philosophy to 1900.* Cambridge; University Press.

Strawson, P.F. (1959). *Individual: an essay in descriptive metaphysics.* London: Methuen & Co.

Tarnas, R. (1991). *The passion of the Western mind.* New York: Ballantine.

Taylor, C.C.W. (1990). Aristotle's epistemology. In Stephen Everson (Ed), *Companions to ancient thought: epistemology.* New York: Cambridge University.

Tillich, P. (1963)."Critique of theology", in (Eds.), S. Spender and I. Kristol. *Encounter.* New York: Basic Books.

Varma, M. (1969). *The philosophy of Indian education.* Meerut: Meekakshi Prakashan.

Victor, P. G. (1992) *Social philosophy of Vedanta: a study of the Upanishads, Bhagavadgita, Brahmasutra and Sankara'a commentaries on them.* Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi and company.

UNITED Publications, (2004). Publicly distributed leaflets. Vancouver, B.C. UNITED Publications.

Vivekananda, S. (1997). *The complete works*. Vol. I, II, IV. Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama.

Wertheimer, M. (1945). *Productive Thinking*. New York; Harper.

Wittgenstein, L. (1994) *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*; *translated by D.F. Pears & B.F. McGuinness*. New York : Routledge.

Wood, A. (1997). *Interpreting the Upanishads*. New Delhi: Swan Press.

Woozley, A.D. (1975). *John Locke: an essay concerning human understanding*. London: Fontana.

Woodruff, P. (1990). Plato's early theory of knowledge. In Stephen Everson (Ed), *Companions to ancient thought: epistemology*. New York: Cambridge University.

Yolton, J. (1961). *An essay concerning human understanding*. London: Dent.

Yvas, R.N. (1982). *Nature of Indian philosophy*. New Delhi: Asian Publications.

Internet word searches done February 20, 2005

1) Intuition - www.nd.edu/~archives/latgramm.htm
2) Philosophy- http://wordinfo.info/words/index.php?v=info&a=view_results&s=philosophy
3) Sruti - www.geocities.com/profvk/sruti.html
4) Epistemology- www.wordinfo.info/words/index.php?v=info&a=view_results&s=epistemology
5) Upanisad texts - http://www.celextel.org/